

# SYMMETRIC NONNEGATIVE FORMS AND SUMS OF SQUARES

GRIGORIY BLEKHERMAN AND CORDIAN RIENER

**ABSTRACT.** We study the relationship between symmetric nonnegative forms and symmetric sums of squares. Our particular emphasis is on the asymptotic behavior when the degree  $2d$  is fixed and the number of variables  $n$  grows. We show that in sharp contrast to the general case the difference between symmetric forms and sums of squares does not grow arbitrarily large for any fixed degree  $2d$ . For degree 4 we show that the difference between symmetric nonnegative forms and sums of squares asymptotically goes to 0. More precisely we relate nonnegative symmetric forms to symmetric power mean inequalities, valid independent of the number of variables. Given a symmetric quartic we show that the related symmetric power mean inequality holds for all  $n \geq 4$ , if and only if the the power mean inequality can be written as a sum of squares for all  $n \geq 4$ . We conjecture that this is true in arbitrary degree  $2d$ .

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $\mathbb{R}[x] := \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$  denote the ring of polynomials in  $n$  real variables and  $H_{n,k}$  the set of forms of degree  $k$ . Certifying that a form  $f \in H_{n,2d}$  assumes only nonnegative values is one of the fundamental questions of real algebra. One such possible certificate is a decomposition of  $f$  as a sum of squares, i.e., one finds forms  $p_1, \dots, p_m \in H_{n,d}$  such that  $f = p_1^2 + \dots + p_m^2$ . In 1888 Hilbert gave a beautiful proof showing that in general not all nonnegative forms can be written as a sum of squares. In fact, he showed that the sum of squares property only characterizes nonnegativity in the cases of binary forms, of quadratic forms, and of ternary quartics. In all other cases there exist forms that are nonnegative but do not allow a decomposition as a sum of squares. Despite its elegance, Hilbert's proof was not constructive. A constructive approach to this question which produced counterexamples appeared in an article by Terpstra [25] in 1939, but the most famous counterexample was found by Motzkin in 1967.

The sum of squares decomposition of nonnegative polynomials has been the cornerstone of recent developments in polynomial optimization. Following ideas of Lasserre and Parrilo, polynomial optimization problems, i.e. the task of finding  $f^* = \min f(x)$  for a polynomial  $f$ , can be relaxed and transferred into semidefinite optimization problems. If  $f - f^*$  can be written as a sum of squares, these semidefinite relaxations are in fact exact. Hence a better understanding of the difference of sums of squares and nonnegative polynomials is highly desirable.

In [2] the first author added to the work of Hilbert by showing that the quantitative gap between sum of squares and nonnegative polynomials of fixed degree grows infinitely large with the number of variables if the degree is at least 4. We now show that the gap need not be large if we enforce additional structure on the nonnegative polynomials.

We study the case of forms in  $n$  variables of degree  $2d$  that are symmetric, i.e., invariant under the action of the symmetric group  $\mathcal{S}_n$  that permutes the variables. Let  $H_{n,2d}^S$  denote the real vector space of symmetric forms of degree  $2d$  in  $n$  variables. Let  $\Sigma_{n,2d}^S$  denote be the cone of forms in  $H_{n,2d}^S$  that can be decomposed as sums of squares and  $\mathcal{P}_{n,2d}^S$  be the cone of nonnegative symmetric forms. Choi and Lam [7] showed that the following symmetric form of degree 4

$$\sum x_i^2 x_j^2 + \sum x_i^2 x_j x_k - 4x_1 x_2 x_3 x_4$$

is nonnegative but cannot be written as a sum of squares. Thus one can conclude that  $\Sigma_{4,4}^S \neq \mathcal{P}_{4,4}^S$  and therefore even in the case of symmetric polynomials the sum of squares property already fails to characterize nonnegativity in the first case covered by Hilbert's classical result.

We show that symmetric sums of squares do not become asymptotically negligible compared to symmetric nonnegative forms for any degree  $2d$ . In the case of degree 4 we show a much stronger result: the gap between symmetric sums of squares and symmetric nonnegative polynomials vanishes asymptotically. This stands in sharp contrast to the general case of (non-symmetric) sums of squares and nonnegative polynomials. We conjecture that the difference between symmetric nonnegative polynomials and symmetric sums of squares asymptotically tends to 0 for any fixed degree  $2d$ .

To establish the asymptotic result we look at a family of symmetric power mean inequalities naturally associated to a symmetric polynomial. The study of such symmetric inequalities has a long history (see for example [9]). In the context of such inequalities Hurwitz [12] showed that a sum of squares decomposition can be used to verify the arithmetic mean-geometric mean inequality. In case of degree 4 we show a family of symmetric power mean inequalities is valid for all  $n$  if and only if each member can be written as a sum of squares.

**1.1. Main Results.** Define the  $i$ -th normalized power sum polynomial to be

$$p_i := \frac{1}{n}(x_1^i + \dots + x_n^i).$$

We will also write  $p_i^{(n)}$  to emphasize the dependence on the number of variables  $n$ .

For a natural number  $k$  a partition  $\lambda$  of  $k$  (written  $\lambda \vdash k$ ) is a sequence of weakly decreasing positive integers  $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_l)$  with  $\sum_{i=1}^l \lambda_i = k$ . Let  $n \geq k$  and for any  $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_l) \vdash k$  construct the polynomial

$$p_\lambda := p_{\lambda_1}^{(n)} \cdot p_{\lambda_2}^{(n)} \cdots p_{\lambda_l}^{(n)}.$$

We will sometimes denote this polynomial by  $p_\lambda^{(n)}$ .

It is well-known that with  $n \geq k$  the polynomials  $\{p_\lambda \mid \lambda \vdash k\}$  form a basis of  $H_{n,k}^S$ , and thus the dimension of  $H_{n,k}^S$  is equal to  $\pi(k)$ , the number of partitions of  $k$ .

By regarding the symmetric forms as collections of coefficients with respect to the basis  $\{p_\lambda^{(n)}\}$  we can view the cones  $\mathcal{P}_{n,2d}^S$  and  $\Sigma_{n,2d}^S$  as lying in  $\mathbb{R}^{\pi(2d)}$  and therefore we can speak of the limits of the sequences of cones  $\mathcal{P}_{n,2d}^S$  and  $\Sigma_{n,2d}^S$  as  $n$  goes to infinity. Let

$$\mathfrak{P}_{2d} = \bigcap_{n=2d}^{\infty} \mathcal{P}_{n,2d}^S \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{S}_{2d} = \bigcap_{n=2d}^{\infty} \Sigma_{n,2d}^S.$$

We show the following

**Theorem 1.1.**

$$\mathfrak{P}_{2d} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{P}_{n,2d}^S \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{S}_{2d} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Sigma_{n,2d}^S.$$

The choice of normalized power mean basis allows us by using the half-degree principle to obtain a simple characterization of the cones  $\mathcal{P}_{n,2d}^S$  as well as the limit cone  $\mathfrak{P}_{2d}$ . The characterization is in terms of nonnegativity of  $2d$ -variate polynomials and is given in Theorem 3.4. This description is crucial in the proof of the Theorem 1.3.

Next we show the following:

**Theorem 1.2.** *The cones  $\mathfrak{P}_{2d}$  and  $\mathfrak{S}_{2d}$  are full-dimensional cones in  $\mathbb{R}^{\pi(2d)}$ .*

Having well-defined full-dimensional limits allows us to show in Corollary 5.3 that the gap between symmetric sums of squares and nonnegative forms does not grow arbitrarily large for any fixed degree  $2d$ . We remark that although we work with specific bases  $\{p_\lambda^{(n)}\}$  of  $H_{n,2d}^S$ , the result is independent of this choice. An appropriate measure of the *ratio* of sizes of the cones  $\mathcal{P}_{n,2d}^S$  and  $\Sigma_{n,2d}^S$ , e.g. the ratio of volumes of compact slices of the cones with a hyperplane, is independent of a specific basis choice. Therefore it suffices to establish existence and full dimensionality of the limit cones  $\mathfrak{S}_{2d}$  and  $\mathfrak{P}_{2d}$ , which is a basis dependent

statement and for which we use the specific basis  $\{p_\lambda^{(n)}\}$ , to conclude that the gap between cones  $\mathcal{P}_{n,2d}^S$  and  $\Sigma_{n,2d}^S$  is bounded for a fixed degree  $2d$ .

We then examine the case of degree  $2d = 4$  in greater detail. In Theorem 6.1 we provide a characterization of the cone of symmetric sums of squares of degree 4. By considering the dual cone, we describe in Theorem 6.8 the faces of  $\Sigma_{n,2d}^S$  which are not faces of the cone of nonnegative polynomials. This allows us to construct in Example 6.9 a sequence of symmetric polynomials, which are strictly positive and yet lie on the boundary of  $\Sigma_{n,2d}^S$  for all  $n \geq 4$ . Finally we show that in degree 4 the cones  $\mathfrak{P}_4$  and  $\mathfrak{S}_4$  coincide:

**Theorem 1.3.**

$$\mathfrak{P}_4 = \mathfrak{S}_4.$$

We conjecture that this happens in arbitrary degree  $2d$ :

**Conjecture 1.**

$$\mathfrak{P}_{2d} = \mathfrak{S}_{2d} \quad \text{for all } d \in \mathbb{N}.$$

## 2. SYMMETRIC POLYNOMIALS AND SYMMETRIC FUNCTIONS

We first introduce notation and recall some well-known facts about symmetric polynomials. It is classically known (for example [14, 2.11]) that the polynomials  $p_1, \dots, p_n$  are algebraically independent generators of the ring of symmetric polynomials, i.e., every symmetric polynomial  $f$  of degree  $2d \leq n$  can uniquely be written as

$$f = g(p_1, \dots, p_{2d})$$

for some polynomial  $g \in \mathbb{R}[z_1, \dots, z_{2d}]$ .

For all  $\lambda \vdash k$  the polynomial  $p_\lambda$  is of degree  $k$ . Since any  $f \in H_{n,k}^S$  can be uniquely expressed as  $f = g(p_1, \dots, p_k)$ , we conclude that every  $f \in H_{n,k}$  can be uniquely expressed as a linear combination of  $p_\lambda$ :

$$f := \sum_{\lambda \vdash k} c_\lambda p_\lambda.$$

Therefore whenever  $k \leq n$  the polynomials  $\{p_\lambda \mid \lambda \vdash k\}$  form a basis of  $H_{n,k}^S$ , and thus the dimension of  $H_{n,k}^S$  is equal to  $\pi(k)$ , the number of partitions of  $k$ . For every  $n \geq 2d$  the basis of symmetric means  $p_\lambda^{(n)}$  realizes the cones  $\mathcal{P}_{n,2d}^S$  and  $\Sigma_{n,2d}^S$  as convex sets in  $\mathbb{R}^{\pi(2d)}$ .

With this choice of basis for each  $H_{n,k}^S$ , every  $p_\lambda$  defines a sequence

$$\mathfrak{p}_\lambda := (p_\lambda^{(k)}, p_\lambda^{(k+1)}, \dots).$$

We will denote the linear space of all such sequences by  $\mathfrak{M}_k$ , and will represent its elements as

$$\mathfrak{f} = \sum_{\lambda \vdash k} c_\lambda \mathfrak{p}_\lambda \in \mathfrak{M}_k.$$

When  $k = 2d$ , we will be interested in the elements of  $\mathfrak{M}_{2d}$  that correspond to nonnegative forms, and sums of squares regardless of the number of variables  $n$ . Accordingly we define:

$$\mathfrak{P}_{2d} := \left\{ \mathfrak{f} \in \mathfrak{M}_{2d} : f^{(n)} = \sum c_\lambda p_\lambda^{(n)} \in \mathcal{P}_{n,2d}^S \text{ for all } n \geq 2d \right\}$$

and

$$\mathfrak{S}_{2d} := \left\{ \mathfrak{f} \in \mathfrak{M}_{2d} : f^{(n)} = \sum c_\lambda p_\lambda^{(n)} \in \Sigma_{n,2d}^S \text{ for all } n \geq 2d \right\}.$$

The cone  $\mathfrak{P}_{2d}$  can be viewed as the set of all symmetric power mean inequalities of degree  $2d$  that are valid independent of the number of variables  $n$ . The question of characterizing the elements of the cone  $\mathfrak{P}_{2d}$  is related to understanding symmetric inequalities such as Newton's inequalities (see [9]).

**Remark 2.1.** The identification of the basis elements of  $H_{n+1,2d}^S$  and  $H_{n,2d}^S$  defines transition maps between these vector spaces. Thus we can view the vector space  $\mathfrak{M}_{2d}$  as the direct limit of the vector spaces  $H_{n,2d}^S$ . Some of the results make particular use of these transition map, or equivalently, the bases chosen. However, a change of basis affects both  $\Sigma_{n,2d}^S$  and  $\mathcal{P}_{n,2d}^S$  in the same way. Since we use the ratio of volumes of compact slices to measure the gap between symmetric sums of squares and nonnegative forms our comparison is not affected by this choice.

### 3. SYMMETRIC NONNEGATIVE FORMS

The key result that we need in order to characterize the elements of  $\mathcal{P}_{n,2d}^S$  is the so-called half degree principle (see [26, 18]): For a natural number  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  we define  $A_k$  to be the set of all points in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  with at most  $k$  distinct components, i.e.,

$$A_k := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}| \leq k\}.$$

The half degree principle says that a symmetric form of degree  $2d > 2$  is nonnegative, if and only if it is nonnegative on  $A_d$ :

**Proposition 3.1** (Half degree principle). *Let  $f \in H_{n,2d}^S$  and set  $k := \max\{2, d\}$ . Then  $f$  is nonnegative if and only if*

$$f(y) \geq 0 \text{ for all } y \in A_k.$$

**Remark 3.2.** By considering  $f - \epsilon(x_1^2 + \dots + x_n^2)^d$  for a sufficiently small  $\epsilon > 0$  we see that we can also replace nonnegative by positive in the above Theorem, thus characterizing strict positivity of symmetric forms.

An ordered sequence of  $k$  natural numbers  $\vartheta := (\vartheta_1, \dots, \vartheta_k)$  such that  $\vartheta_1 + \dots + \vartheta_k = n$  is called a  $k$ -partition of  $n$  (written  $\vartheta \vdash_k n$ ). Given a symmetric form  $f \in H_{n,2d}^S$  and  $\vartheta$  a  $k$ -partition of  $n$  we define  $f^\vartheta \in \mathbb{R}[t_1, \dots, t_k]$  via

$$f^\vartheta(t_1, \dots, t_k) := f(\underbrace{t_1, \dots, t_1}_{\vartheta_1}, \underbrace{t_2, \dots, t_2}_{\vartheta_2}, \dots, \underbrace{t_k, \dots, t_k}_{\vartheta_k}).$$

From now on assume that  $2d > 2$ . Then the half-degree principle implies that nonnegativity of  $f = \sum_{\lambda \vdash 2d} c_\lambda p_\lambda$  is equivalent to nonnegativity of

$$f^\vartheta := \sum_{\lambda \vdash 2d} c_\lambda p_\lambda^\vartheta(t_1, \dots, t_k)$$

for all  $\vartheta \vdash_d n$ , since the polynomials  $f^\vartheta$  give the values of  $f$  on all points with at most  $d$  parts. We note that for all  $i \in \mathbb{N}$  we have

$$p_i^\vartheta = \frac{1}{n}(\vartheta_1 t_1^i + \vartheta_2 t_2^i + \dots + \vartheta_d t_d^i).$$

For a partition  $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_l) \vdash 2d$  we define a  $2d$ -variate form  $\Phi_\lambda$  in the variables  $s_1, \dots, s_d$  and  $t_1, \dots, t_d$  by

$$\Phi_\lambda(s_1, \dots, s_d, t_1, \dots, t_d) = \prod_{i=1}^l (s_1 t_1^{\lambda_i} + s_2 t_2^{\lambda_i} + \dots + s_d t_d^{\lambda_i})$$

and use it to associate to any form  $f \in H_{n,2d}^S$ ,  $f = \sum_{\lambda \vdash 2d} c_\lambda p_\lambda$  the form

$$\Phi_f := \sum_{\lambda \vdash 2d} c_\lambda \Phi_\lambda.$$

Note that

$$\Phi_\lambda\left(\frac{\vartheta_1}{n}, \dots, \frac{\vartheta_d}{n}, t_1, \dots, t_d\right) = p_\lambda^\vartheta(t_1, \dots, t_d).$$

We define the set

$$W_n = \{w = (w_1, \dots, w_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid n \cdot w_i \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}, \text{ and } w_1 + \dots + w_d = 1\}.$$

It follows from the arguments above that  $f \in H_{n,2d}^S$  is nonnegative if and only if the forms  $\Phi_f(s, t)$  are nonnegative forms in  $t$  for all  $w \in W_n$ . This is summarized in the following corollary.

**Corollary 3.3.** *Let  $f = \sum_{\lambda \vdash 2d} c_\lambda p_\lambda$  be a form in  $H_{n,2d}^S$ . Then  $f$  is nonnegative (positive) if and only if for all  $w \in W_n$  the  $d$ -variate forms  $\Phi_f(w, t)$  are nonnegative (positive).*

This result enables us to characterize the elements of  $\mathfrak{P}_{2d}$ . We expand the sets  $W_n$  to the standard simplex  $\Delta$  in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ :

$$\Delta := \{ \alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d) \in [0, 1]^d : \alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_d = 1 \}.$$

Then we have the following Theorem characterizing  $\mathfrak{P}_{2d}$ .

**Theorem 3.4.** *Let  $\mathfrak{f} \in \mathfrak{M}_{2d}$  be the sequence defined by  $f^{(n)} = \sum_{\lambda \vdash 2d} c_\lambda p_\lambda^{(n)}$ . Then  $\mathfrak{f} \in \mathfrak{P}_{2d}$  if and only if the  $2d$ -variate polynomial  $\Phi_f(s, t)$  is nonnegative on  $\Delta \times \mathbb{R}^d$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose that  $\Phi_f(s, t)$  is nonnegative on  $\Delta \times \mathbb{R}^d$ . Let  $f^{(n)} = \sum c_\lambda p_\lambda^{(n)}$ . Since  $W_n \subset \Delta$  for all  $n$  we see from Corollary 3.3 that  $f^{(n)}$  is a nonnegative form for all  $n$  and thus  $\mathfrak{f} \in \mathfrak{P}_{2d}$ .

On the other hand, suppose there exists  $\alpha_0 \in \Delta$  such that  $\Phi_f(\alpha_0, t) < 0$  for some  $t \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . Then we can find a rational point  $\alpha \in \Delta$  with all positive coordinates and sufficiently close to  $\alpha_0$  so that  $\Phi_f(\alpha, t) < 0$ .

Let  $h$  be the least common multiple of the denominators of  $\alpha$ . Then we have  $\alpha \in W_{ah}$  for all  $a \in \mathbb{N}$ . Choose  $a$  such that  $ah \geq 2d$ . Then  $f^{(ah)}$  is negative at the corresponding point and we have  $\mathfrak{f} \notin \mathfrak{P}_{2d}$ .  $\square$

Our choice of basis embeds the cones  $\mathcal{P}_{n,2d}^S$  and  $\Sigma_{n,2d}^S$  into the real vector space  $\mathbb{R}^{\pi(2d)}$  for all  $n \geq 2d$ . These sequences are not nested in general, however we have the following:

**Proposition 3.5.** *Consider the cones  $\mathcal{P}_{n,2d}^S$  as convex subsets of  $\mathbb{R}^{\pi(2d)}$  using the coefficients  $c_\lambda$  of  $p_\lambda$ . Then for every  $n \geq 2d$  and  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$  we have*

$$\mathcal{P}_{\ell \cdot n, 2d}^S \subseteq \mathcal{P}_{n, 2d}^S \subset \mathbb{R}^{\pi(2d)}.$$

*Proof.* Let  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$  be a point in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and let  $\tilde{x}$  be the point in  $\mathbb{R}^{\ell \cdot n}$  with each  $x_i$  repeated  $\ell$  times. Now we have

$$p_i^{(\ell \cdot n)}(\tilde{x}) = \frac{1}{\ell^n} (\ell x_1^i + \dots + \ell x_n^i) = p_i^{(n)}(x).$$

It follows that  $f^{(\ell n)} \in \mathcal{P}_{\ell n, d}^S \Rightarrow f^{(n)} \in \mathcal{P}_{n, d}^S$  which proves the inclusion.  $\square$

**Remark 3.6.** *We note that the same proof also yields that  $\Sigma_{\ell \cdot n, 2d}^S \subseteq \Sigma_{n, 2d}^S$ .*

Now we prove existence of the limits of sequences  $\mathcal{P}_{n, 2d}^S$ .

*Proof of Theorem 1.1 for  $\mathcal{P}_{n, 2d}^S$ .* We have  $\mathfrak{P}_{2d} = \bigcap_{n=2d}^{\infty} \mathcal{P}_{n, 2d}^S$  by definition. By Proposition 3.5 the sequence  $\mathcal{P}_{n, 2d}^S$  contains decreasing subsequences. This in turn implies that  $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{P}_{n, 2d}^S = \mathfrak{P}_{2d}$ . To prove the statement it remains to verify that no  $\mathfrak{f} \notin \mathfrak{P}_{2d}$  is an accumulation point. It follows from Theorem 3.4 that  $\mathfrak{f} \notin \mathfrak{P}_{2d}$  is equivalent to  $\Phi_f(\alpha, t) < 0$  for some  $(\alpha, t) \in \Delta \times \mathbb{R}^d$ . Since  $\Phi_f$  depends continuously on  $\mathfrak{f}$  this excludes accumulation points outside  $\mathfrak{P}_{2d}$ . Thus the limit exists and is equal to  $\mathfrak{P}_{2d}$ .  $\square$

#### 4. SYMMETRIC SUMS OF SQUARES

We now consider symmetric sums of squares. It was already observed in [10] that invariance under a group action allows us to demand sum of squares decompositions which put strong restrictions on the underlying squares. While the results below hold for an arbitrary representation of a finite group  $G$ , we restrict the presentation to the case of the symmetric group  $\mathcal{S}_n$  acting on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  by permuting the variables. Our presentation follows the ideas of [10] and full proofs are presented there.

The permutation action of  $\mathcal{S}_n$  on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  induces a  $\mathcal{S}_n$ -action on the polynomial ring  $\mathbb{R}[x]$  and the map

$$\begin{aligned} \text{sym} : \mathbb{R}[x] &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}[x]^{\mathcal{S}_n} \\ f &\mapsto \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_n} \sigma(f) \end{aligned}$$

defines a projection from the ring of polynomials to the ring of symmetric polynomials. We will sometimes use  $\text{sym}_n$  to denote the same map and emphasize dependence on the number of variables  $n$ .

The description of the set of all sums of squares from a finite dimensional  $\mathcal{S}_n$ -submodule  $T$  of  $\mathbb{R}[x]$  depends on its decomposition into irreducible submodules:

$$T = V^{(1)} \oplus V^{(2)} \oplus \dots \oplus V^{(h)},$$

where  $V^{(j)}$  are the *isotypic components*, i.e., direct sums of some pairwise isomorphic irreducible representations  $W_1^{(j)}, W_2^{(j)}, \dots, W_{m_j}^{(j)}$  each of dimension  $\nu_j \in \mathbb{N}$ . Pick any nonzero form  $f_1^{(j)} \in W_1^{(j)}$ . By Schur's Lemma there exists a unique (up to a scalar multiple)  $\mathcal{S}_n$ -commuting isomorphism between  $W_1^{(j)}$  and  $W_k^{(j)}$  for any  $k \geq 1$ . Then for each  $k$  define  $f_k^{(j)} \in W_k^{(j)}$  to be the image of  $f_1^{(j)}$  under this isomorphism. We call the forms  $f_k^{(j)}$  defined in such a way a *symmetry basis* of the isotypic component  $V^{(j)}$ . We note that there are many possible choices for the symmetry basis as it depends on the decomposition of  $V^{(j)}$  into the irreducible submodules  $W_k^{(j)}$  and on the choice of the form  $f_1^{(j)}$ .

Let  $p \in \mathbb{R}[x]$  be a symmetric sum of squares from  $T$ . The crucial point is that we can write  $p$  as a symmetrization of a sum of squares of linear combinations of  $f_k^{(j)}$ :

$$p = \text{sym} \sum_{j=1}^h (a_1^j f_1^{(j)} + a_2^j f_2^{(j)} \dots + a_{m_j}^j f_{m_j}^{(j)})^2 \quad \text{with coefficients} \quad a_i^j \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (4.1)$$

We observe that if we take two forms from non-isomorphic representations of  $\mathcal{S}_n$ , then symmetrization of their product is zero:

$$\text{sym}(f_i^{(j)} f_k^{(l)}) = 0 \quad \text{whenever} \quad j \neq l. \quad (4.2)$$

Now let

$$g_{ik}^{(j)} = \text{sym}(f_i^{(j)} f_k^{(j)}).$$

It follows from (4.1) that we can write:

$$p = \sum_{j=1}^h b_{ik}^j g_{ik}^{(j)} \quad \text{with coefficients} \quad b_{ik}^j \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Furthermore for  $j = 1, \dots, h$  let  $B^{(j)}$  be the matrix with entries  $b_{ik}^j$ . Then the matrices  $B^{(j)}$  coming from the above decomposition of  $f$  can be taken to be positive semidefinite. This is summarized in the following Theorem [10]:

**Theorem 4.1.** *Let  $p \in \mathbb{R}[x]^{\mathcal{S}}$  be a symmetric polynomial. Then  $p$  is a sum of squares of polynomials in  $T$  if and only if  $p$  can be written as*

$$p = \sum b_{ik}^j g_{ik}^{(j)}.$$

*with the corresponding matrices  $B^{(j)} = (b_{ik}^j)$  positive semidefinite.*

We can also restate Theorem 4.1 in terms of matrix polynomials, i.e. matrices with polynomial entries. Given two  $k \times k$  symmetric matrices  $A$  and  $B$  define their inner product as  $\langle A, B \rangle = \text{trace}(AB)$ . Define a block-diagonal symmetric matrix  $A$  with  $h$  blocks  $A^{(1)}, \dots, A^{(h)}$  with the entries of each block given by:

$$A_{ik}^{(j)} = g_{ik}^{(j)} = \text{sym}(f_i^{(j)} f_k^{(j)}).$$

Then Theorem 4.1 is equivalent to the following statement:

**Corollary 4.2.** *Let  $p \in \mathbb{R}[x]^S$  be a symmetric polynomial. Then  $p$  is a sum of squares of polynomials in  $T$  if and only if  $p$  can be written as*

$$p = \langle A, B \rangle,$$

where  $B$  is a positive semidefinite matrix with real entries.

We can apply Theorem 4.1 to a symmetric form  $p \in H_{n,2d}^S$ . We know that if such  $p$  is a sum of squares, then it is a sum of squares from  $H_{n,d}$  and therefore to apply Theorem 4.1 with  $T = H_{n,d}$  we need to identify a representative in every irreducible representation of  $H_{n,d}$ . We first recall some useful facts from the representation theory of  $\mathcal{S}_n$ . We refer to [13, 20] for more details.

**4.1. Specht Modules as Polynomials.** Let  $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_l) \vdash n$ . A *Young tableau* for  $\lambda$  consists of  $l$  rows, with  $\lambda_i$  entries in the  $i$ -th row. Each entry is an element in  $\{1, \dots, n\}$ , and each of these numbers occurs exactly once. A *standard Young tableau* is a Young tableau in which all rows and columns are increasing. An element  $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_n$  acts on a Young tableau by replacing each entry by its image under  $\sigma$ . Two Young tableaux  $t_1$  and  $t_2$  are called *row-equivalent* if the corresponding rows of the two tableaux contain the same numbers. The classes of row-equivalent Young tableaux are called *tabloids*, and the equivalence class of a tableau  $t$  is denoted by  $\{t\}$ . The stabilizer of a row-equivalence class is called the row-stabilizer. The action of  $\mathcal{S}_n$  gives rise to the *permutation module*  $M^\lambda$  corresponding to  $\lambda$  which is the  $\mathcal{S}_n$ -module defined by  $M^\lambda = \mathbb{R}\{\{t_1\}, \dots, \{t_s\}\}$ , where  $\{t_1\}, \dots, \{t_s\}$  is a complete list of  $\lambda$ -tabloids and  $\mathbb{R}\{\{t_1\}, \dots, \{t_s\}\}$  denotes their  $\mathbb{R}$ -linear span.

Let  $t$  be a Young tableau for  $\lambda \vdash n$ , and let  $C_i$  be the entries in the  $i$ -th column of  $t$ . The group

$$\text{CStab}_t = \mathcal{S}_{C_1} \times \mathcal{S}_{C_2} \times \dots \times \mathcal{S}_{C_\nu} \quad (\text{where } \mathcal{S}_{C_i} \text{ is the symmetric group on } C_i)$$

is called the *column stabilizer* of  $t$ . The irreducible representations of the symmetric group  $\mathcal{S}_n$  are in 1-1-correspondence with the partitions of  $n$ , and they are given by the Specht modules, as explained below. For  $\lambda \vdash n$ , the *polytabloid associated with  $t$*  is defined by

$$e_t = \sum_{\sigma \in \text{CStab}_t} \text{sgn}(\sigma) \sigma \{t\}.$$

Then for a partition  $\lambda \vdash n$ , the *Specht module*  $S^\lambda$  is the submodule of the permutation module  $M^\lambda$  spanned by the polytabloids  $e_t$ . The dimension of  $S^\lambda$  is given by the number of standard Young tableaux for  $\lambda \vdash n$ , which we will denote by  $s_\lambda$ . A generalized *Young tableau of shape  $\lambda$*  is a Young tableau  $T$  for  $\lambda$  such that the entries are replaced by any  $n$ -tuple of natural numbers. The *content* of  $T$  is the sequence  $\mu_i$  such that  $\mu_i$  is equal to the number of  $i$ 's in  $T$ . A generalized Young tableau is called *semi-standard*, if its rows weakly increase and its columns strictly increase.

The decomposition of the module  $M^\mu$  for a general partition  $\mu \vdash n$  will be of special interest for us. It can be described in a rather combinatorial way. For two partitions  $\lambda, \mu \vdash k$  we write  $\lambda \supseteq \mu$  if  $\lambda_1 + \dots + \lambda_i \geq \mu_1 + \dots + \mu_i$  for all  $i$ . Then we have the following:

**Proposition 4.3.** *For a partition  $\mu \vdash n$ , the permutation module  $M^\mu$  decomposes as*

$$M^\mu = \bigoplus_{\lambda \supseteq \mu} K_{\lambda\mu} S^\lambda,$$

where for two partitions  $\lambda, \mu \vdash n$  the number  $K_{\lambda\mu}$  is the so called Kostka number, which is defined to be the number of semi-standard Young tableaux of shape  $\lambda$  and content  $\mu$

A classical construction of Specht realizes Specht modules as submodules of the polynomial ring (see [24]): For  $\lambda \vdash n$  let  $t_\lambda$  be a standard Young tableau of shape  $\lambda$  and  $C_1, \dots, C_\nu$  be the columns of  $t_\lambda$ . To  $t_\lambda$  we associate the monomial  $X^{t_\lambda} := \prod_{i=1}^n X_i^{m(i)-1}$ , where  $m(i)$  is the index of the row of  $t_\lambda$  containing  $i$ . Note that for any  $\lambda$ -tabloid  $\{t_\lambda\}$  the monomial  $X^{t_\lambda}$  is well defined, and the mapping  $\{t_\lambda\} \mapsto X^{t_\lambda}$  is an  $\mathcal{S}_n$ -isomorphism. For any column  $C_i$  of  $t_\lambda$  we denote by  $C_i(j)$  the element in the  $j$ -th row and we associate to it a Vandermonde determinant:

$$\text{Van}_{C_i} := \det \begin{pmatrix} X_{C_i(1)}^0 & \cdots & X_{C_i(k)}^0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ X_{C_i(1)}^{k-1} & \cdots & X_{C_i(k)}^{k-1} \end{pmatrix} = \prod_{j < l} (X_{C_i(j)} - X_{C_i(l)}).$$

The *Specht polynomial*  $sp_{t_\lambda}$  associated to  $t_\lambda$  is defined as

$$sp_{t_\lambda} := \prod_{i=1}^\nu \text{Van}_{C_i} = \sum_{\sigma \in \text{CStab}_{t_\lambda}} \text{sgn}(\sigma) \sigma(X^{t_\lambda}),$$

where  $\text{CStab}_{t_\lambda}$  is the column stabilizer of  $t_\lambda$ .

By the  $\mathcal{S}_n$ -isomorphism  $\{t_\lambda\} \mapsto X^{t_\lambda}$ ,  $\mathcal{S}_n$  acts on  $sp_{t_\lambda}$  in the same way as on the polytabloid  $e_{t_\lambda}$ . If  $t_{\lambda,1}, \dots, t_{\lambda,k}$  denote all standard Young tableaux associated to  $\lambda$ , then the set of polynomials  $sp_{t_{\lambda,1}}, \dots, sp_{t_{\lambda,k}}$  are called the *Specht polynomials* associated to  $\lambda$ . We then have the following Proposition [24]:

**Proposition 4.4.** *The Specht polynomials  $sp_{t_{\lambda,1}}, \dots, sp_{t_{\lambda,k}}$  span an  $\mathcal{S}_n$ -submodule of  $\mathbb{R}[x]$  which is isomorphic to the Specht module  $S^\lambda$ .*

The Specht polynomials identify a submodule of  $\mathbb{R}[x]$  isomorphic to  $S^\lambda$ . In order to get a decomposition of the entire ring  $\mathbb{R}[x]$  we need to consider  $\mathcal{S}_n$ -harmonic polynomials.

**4.2. Decomposition of  $\mathbb{R}[x]$  and  $\mathcal{S}_n$ -harmonic polynomials.** The  $\mathcal{S}_n$ -harmonic polynomials are defined to be polynomials that are annihilated by differential operators corresponding to symmetric polynomials:

$$D_f := f \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial x_1}, \dots, \frac{\partial}{\partial x_n} \right), \quad \text{for all symmetric forms } f \in \mathbb{R}[x].$$

We denote the  $\mathcal{S}_n$ -module of  $\mathcal{S}_n$ -harmonic polynomials by  $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{S}_n}$ . It is known (see [1, 22]) that  $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{S}_n}$  is generated by all partial derivatives of the Vandermonde determinant

$$\delta := \prod_{i < j}^n (X_i - X_j),$$

and that  $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{S}_n}$  is isomorphic to the regular representation of  $\mathcal{S}_n$ . Further a result by Chevalley [6] characterizes the structure of  $\mathbb{R}[x]$  as an  $\mathcal{S}_n$ -module

$$\mathbb{R}[x] = \mathbb{R}[x]^{\mathcal{S}_n} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{S}_n}. \quad (4.3)$$

Since  $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{S}_n}$  is isomorphic to the regular representation of  $\mathcal{S}_n$  we have the decomposition

$$\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{S}_n} = \bigoplus_{\lambda \vdash n} s_\lambda S^\lambda.$$

For every  $\lambda \vdash n$  we can choose  $s_\lambda$  many harmonic polynomials  $\{q_1^\lambda, \dots, q_{s_\lambda}^\lambda\}$  that form a symmetry basis of the  $\lambda$ -isotypic component of  $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{S}_n}$ . Using these polynomials define matrix polynomials  $Q^\lambda$  by:

$$Q^\lambda(i, j) := \text{sym}(q_i^\lambda \cdot q_j^\lambda).$$

By (4.3) we can think of polynomials in  $\mathbb{R}[x]$  as linear combinations of elements of  $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{S}_n}$  with coefficients in  $\mathbb{R}[x]^{\mathcal{S}_n}$ . Therefore the following theorem can be thought of as a generalization of Corollary 4.2 to sums of squares from an  $\mathcal{S}_n$ -module with coefficients in an  $\mathcal{S}_n$ -invariant ring (see [10, Theorem 6.2]):

**Theorem 4.5.** *Let  $f \in \mathbb{R}[x]$  be a symmetric polynomial. Then  $f$  is a sum of squares if and only if it can be written in the form*

$$f = \sum_{\lambda \vdash n} \langle P^\lambda, Q^\lambda \rangle,$$

where each  $P^\lambda \in \mathbb{R}[x]^{s_\lambda \times s_\lambda}$  is a sum of symmetric squares matrix polynomial, i.e.

$$P^\lambda(x) = L^t(x)L(x)$$

for some matrix polynomial  $L(x)$  whose entries are symmetric polynomials.

Each entry of the matrix  $Q^\lambda$  is a symmetric polynomial and thus can be represented as a polynomial in the power means  $p_1, \dots, p_n$ . Therefore exists a matrix polynomial  $\tilde{Q}^\lambda(z_1, \dots, z_n)$  in  $n$  variables  $z_1, \dots, z_n$  such that

$$\tilde{Q}^\lambda(p_1(x), \dots, p_n(x)) = Q^\lambda(x).$$

Therefore we can restate Theorem 4.5 in the following way:

**Theorem 4.6.** *With the notation from above let  $f \in \mathbb{R}[x]$  be a symmetric polynomial and  $g \in \mathbb{R}[z_1, \dots, z_n]$  such that  $g(p_1, \dots, p_n) = f$ . Then  $f$  is a sum of squares if and only if  $g$  can be written in the form*

$$g = \sum_{\lambda \vdash n} \langle P^\lambda, \tilde{Q}^\lambda \rangle,$$

where each  $P^\lambda \in \mathbb{R}[z]^{s_\lambda \times s_\lambda}$  is a sum of squares matrix polynomial, i.e.  $P^\lambda := L(z)^t L(z)$  for some matrix polynomial  $L$ .

While Theorem 4.5 gives a characterization of symmetric sums of squares in a given number of variables, we need to understand the behavior of the  $\mathcal{S}_n$ -module  $H_{n,d}$  for polynomials of a fixed degree  $d$  in a growing number of variables  $n$ .

**4.3. The case of fixed degree.** A symmetric sum of squares  $f \in \Sigma_{n,2d}^S$  has to be a sum of squares from  $H_{n,d}$ . Therefore we now consider restricting the degree of the squares in the underlying sum of squares representation. Let  $\mathcal{H}_{S_n,d}$  be the vector space of  $\mathcal{S}_n$ -harmonic polynomials of degree at most  $d$ :

$$\mathcal{H}_{S_n,d} = \{f \in \mathcal{H}_{S_n} \mid \deg f \leq d\}.$$

We first consider the case  $n = 2d$ . Let

$$\mathcal{H}_{S_{2d},d} = \bigoplus_{\lambda \vdash 2d} m_\lambda S^\lambda,$$

be the decomposition of  $\mathcal{H}_{S_{2d},d}$  as an  $\mathcal{S}_{2d}$ -module. For a partition  $\lambda \vdash 2d$  and  $n \geq 2d$  define a new partition  $\lambda^{(n)} \vdash n$  by simply increasing the first part of  $\lambda$  by  $n - 2d$ :  $\lambda_1^{(n)} = \lambda_1 + n - 2d$  and  $\lambda_i^{(n)} = \lambda_i$  for  $i \geq 2$ . Then by (4.3) and [17, Theorem 4.7.] it follows that

$$\mathcal{H}_{S_n,d} = \bigoplus_{\lambda \vdash 2d} m_\lambda S^{\lambda^{(n)}}.$$

Now for every  $\lambda \vdash 2d$  we choose  $m_\lambda$  many harmonic forms  $\{q_1^\lambda, \dots, q_{m_\lambda}^\lambda\}$  that form a symmetry basis of the  $\lambda$ -isotypic component of  $\mathcal{H}_{S_{2d},d}$ . Let  $q_\lambda = (q_1^\lambda, \dots, q_{m_\lambda}^\lambda)$  be a vector with entries  $q_i^\lambda$ . As before we construct a matrix  $Q_{2d}^\lambda$  by:

$$Q_{2d}^\lambda = \text{sym}_{2d}(q_\lambda^t q_\lambda) \quad Q_{2d}^\lambda(i, j) = \text{sym}_{2d}(q_i^\lambda \cdot q_j^\lambda).$$

We now claim that the forms  $\{q_1^\lambda, \dots, q_{m_\lambda}^\lambda\}$  when viewed as functions in  $n$  variables also form a symmetry basis of the  $\lambda^{(n)}$ -isotypic component of  $\mathcal{H}_{S_n,d}$  for all  $n \geq 2d$ . Indeed consider a standard Young tableaux  $t_\lambda$  of shape  $\lambda$  and construct a standard Young tableau  $t_{\lambda^{(n)}}$  of shape  $\lambda^{(n)}$  by adding numbers  $2d + 1, \dots, n$  as rightmost entries of the top row of  $t_{\lambda^{(n)}}$ , while keeping the rest of the filling of  $t_{\lambda^{(n)}}$  the same as for  $t_\lambda$ . It follows by construction of the Specht polynomials that

$$sp_{t_\lambda} = sp_{t_{\lambda^{(n)}}}.$$

We may assume, that the  $q_k^{(\lambda)}$  were chosen such that they map to  $sp_{t_\lambda}$  by an  $\mathcal{S}_{2d}$ -isomorphism. We observe that  $sp_{t_\lambda}$  (and therefore  $sp_{t_\lambda^{(n)}}$ ) and  $q_k^\lambda$  do not involve any of the variables  $x_j$ ,  $j > 2d$ . Therefore both are stabilized by  $\mathcal{S}_{n-2d}$  (operating on these last variables), and further the action on the first  $2d$  variables is exactly the same. Thus there is an  $\mathcal{S}_n$ -isomorphism mapping  $q_k^\lambda$  to  $sp_{t_\lambda^{(n)}}$  and the  $\mathcal{S}_n$ -modules generated by the two polynomials are isomorphic. Therefore it follows that  $q_k^{(\lambda)}$  also form a symmetry basis of the  $\lambda^{(n)}$  isotypic component of  $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{S}_n, d}$ .

Now we define a matrix  $Q_n^\lambda$  by

$$Q_n = \text{sym}_n(q_\lambda^t q_\lambda) \quad Q_n^\lambda(i, j) = \text{sym}_n q_i^\lambda q_j^\lambda.$$

By the above we have the following:

**Corollary 4.7.** *The matrix  $Q_n^\lambda$  is the  $\mathcal{S}_n$ -symmetrization of the matrix  $Q_{2d}^\lambda$ :*

$$Q_n^\lambda = \text{sym}_n Q_{2d}^\lambda.$$

We can also apply Theorem 4.5 to our fixed degree situation and obtain the following:

**Corollary 4.8.** *Let  $f \in H_{n, 2d}^{\mathcal{S}}$  be a symmetric polynomial. Then  $f$  is a sum of squares if and only if it can be written in the form*

$$f = \sum_{\lambda \vdash 2d} \langle P^\lambda, Q_n^\lambda \rangle,$$

where each  $P^\lambda \in \mathbb{R}[x]^{m_\lambda \times m_\lambda}$  is a sum of symmetric squares matrix polynomial, i.e.

$$P^\lambda(x) = L_\lambda^t(x) L_\lambda(x)$$

for some matrix polynomial  $L_\lambda(x)$  whose entries are symmetric forms. Additionally for every column  $k$  of  $L_\lambda$  we have

$$\deg Q_n^\lambda(i, i) + 2 \deg L_\lambda(k, i) = 2d,$$

or equivalently every entry  $P^\lambda(i, j)$  of  $P^\lambda$  is a form such that,

$$\deg Q_n^\lambda(i, j) + \deg P^\lambda(i, j) = 2d.$$

We remark that the sum of squares decomposition of  $f = \sum_{\lambda \vdash 2d} \langle P^\lambda, Q_n^\lambda \rangle$ , with  $P^\lambda = L_\lambda^t L_\lambda$  can be read off as follows:

$$f = \sum_{\lambda \vdash 2d} \text{sym}_n q_\lambda^t P^\lambda q_\lambda = \sum_{\lambda \vdash 2d} \text{sym}_n (L_\lambda q_\lambda)^t L_\lambda q_\lambda. \quad (4.4)$$

Let  $k_{i,j}$  be the degree of the  $(i, j)$  entry of  $Q_n^\lambda$ . In view of Corollary 4.7 the number  $k_{i,j}$  is independent of  $n$ . We now regard the polynomial entries in the matrix  $Q_n^\lambda$  as being expressed in the weighted power sum basis  $p_\mu^{(n)}$ :

$$Q_n^\lambda(i, j) = \sum_{\mu \vdash k_{i,j}} c_\mu^{(n)} p_\mu^{(n)}, \quad c_\mu^{(n)} \in \mathbb{R}.$$

In this way we can consider the  $(i, j)$ -entry of the matrix  $Q_n^\lambda$  to be a vector  $c(i, j) \in \mathbb{R}^{\pi(k_{i,j})}$ :

$$c(i, j) = (c_\mu^{(n)})$$

and we now consider the entry-wise limit

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Q_n^\lambda.$$

First we introduce a different basis of  $H_{n,k}$ . Let  $\mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_r)$  be a partition of  $k$ . Associate to  $\mu$  the monomial  $x_1^{\mu_1} \cdots x_r^{\mu_r}$  and define symmetric form  $m_\mu^{(n)}$  by:

$$m_\mu^{(n)} = \text{sym}_n(x_1^{\mu_1} \cdots x_r^{\mu_r}).$$

Consider the matrix  $Q_{2d}^\lambda$  and express its  $(i, j)$ -entry in terms of the basis  $m_\mu^{(2d)}$ :

$$Q_{2d}^\lambda(i, j) = \sum_{\mu \vdash k_{i,j}} \mathcal{C}_{i,j}^\mu m_\mu^{(2d)}, \quad \mathcal{C}_{i,j}^\mu \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Define the matrix  $Q_\infty^\lambda$  by

$$Q_\infty^\lambda(i, j) = \mathcal{C}_{i,j}^\mu.$$

We are now ready to state and prove following Proposition:

**Proposition 4.9.** *For every  $\lambda \vdash 2d$  we have*

$$Q_\infty^\lambda = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Q_n^\lambda.$$

*Proof.* From Corollary 4.7 we know that:

$$Q_n^\lambda(i, j) = \text{sym}_n Q_{2d}^\lambda(i, j).$$

Recall that we defined

$$Q_{2d}^\lambda(i, j) = \sum_{\mu \vdash k_{i,j}} \mathcal{C}_{i,j}^\mu m_\mu^{(2d)}.$$

The symmetrization of each  $m_\mu^{(2d)}$  with respect to  $\mathcal{S}_n$  is simple, we have:

$$\text{sym}_n m_\mu^{(2d)} = m_\mu^{(n)},$$

since  $m_\mu^{(2d)}$  is a sum of monomials with isomorphic stabilizers. Therefore we have

$$Q_n^\lambda(i, j) = \sum_{\mu \vdash k_{i,j}} \mathcal{C}_{i,j}^\mu m_\mu^{(n)}.$$

Now we just need to examine the transition between the basis  $m_\mu^{(n)}$  and  $p_\nu^{(n)}$  of  $H_{n, k_{i,j}}$ .

Let  $\mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_r)$  be a partition of  $k_{i,j}$ . Let  $t$  be the number of distinct parts of  $\mu$  and for  $1 \leq i \leq t$  let  $s_i$  be the number of parts of  $\mu$  equal to the  $i$ -th distinct part of  $\mu$ . It follows that  $r = s_1 + \dots + s_t$ .

Since the stabilizer of the monomial  $x_1^{\mu_1} \dots x_r^{\mu_r}$  is isomorphic to  $\mathcal{S}_{s_1} \times \dots \times \mathcal{S}_{s_t} \times \mathcal{S}_{n-r}$  it follows that

$$m_\mu^{(n)} = \frac{s_1! \dots s_t! (n-r)!}{n!} \bar{m}_\mu^{(n)} = \left( \frac{n}{s_1 \dots s_t} \right)^{-1} \bar{m}_\mu^{(n)},$$

where  $\bar{m}_\mu^{(n)}$  is the monomial symmetric polynomial associated to  $\mu$ .

The transition matrix between power sum symmetric polynomials and monomial symmetric polynomials is well understood [5]. Since  $n \geq 2d \geq k_{i,j}$  converting to our weighted bases we have the following: let  $\nu := (\nu_1, \dots, \nu_l) \vdash k_{i,j}$ ,  $\mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_r) \vdash k_{i,j}$ , then:

$$m_\mu^{(n)} = \sum_{\nu \vdash k_{i,j}} (-1)^{r-l} \frac{(n-r)! |\mathcal{BL}(\mu)^\nu|}{n!} n^l p_\nu^{(n)},$$

where  $|\mathcal{BL}(\mu)^\nu|$  is the number of  $\mu$ -brick permutations of shape  $\nu$  [5]. We observe that the the highest order of growth in  $n$  for a coefficient of  $p_\nu^{(n)}$  occurs when the number of parts of  $\nu$  is maximized. The unique  $\nu$  with the largest number of parts and nonzero  $|\mathcal{BL}(\mu)^\nu|$  is  $\mu$ . Thus we have  $\nu = \mu$ ,  $r = l$ , and

$$|\mathcal{BL}(\mu)^\mu| = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n^r (n-r)!}{n!} = 1.$$

Therefore we see that asymptotically

$$m_\mu^{(n)} = p_\mu^{(n)} + \sum_{\nu \vdash k_{i,j}, \nu \neq \mu} a_{\mu,\nu}(n) p_\nu^{(n)},$$

where the coefficients  $a_{\mu,\nu}(n)$  tend to 0 as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . The Proposition now follows. □

Now we would like to establish that the sequence of cones  $\Sigma_{n,2d}^S$  when viewed as subset of  $\mathbb{R}^{\pi(2d)}$  via the basis  $p_\mu^{(n)}$  has a well defined limit  $\mathfrak{S}_{2d}$  and  $\mathfrak{S}_{2d} = \bigcap_{n=2d}^\infty \Sigma_{n,2d}^S$ .

*Proof of Theorem 1.1 for  $\Sigma_{n,2d}^S$ .* Let  $\mathbb{R}[x]_{n,2d}$  denote the vector space of real polynomials of degree at most  $2d$ . Let  $\mathbb{R}[x]_{n,2d}^{m_\lambda \times m_\lambda}$  be the vector space of matrix polynomials in  $n$  variables of degree at most  $2d$ , with matrices of size  $m_\lambda$  by  $m_\lambda$ .

Define the projection

$$\mathcal{L}_n^\lambda : \mathbb{R}[x]_{n,2d}^{m_\lambda \times m_\lambda} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}[x], \quad \mathcal{L}_n^\lambda(M) = \langle M(p_1^{(n)}, \dots, p_n^{(n)}), Q_n^\lambda \rangle.$$

Now define projection

$$\mathcal{L}_n : \bigoplus_{\lambda \vdash 2d} \mathbb{R}[x]_{n,2d}^{m_\lambda \times m_\lambda} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}[x], \quad \mathcal{L}_n(\bigoplus_{\lambda \vdash 2d} M^\lambda) = \sum_{\lambda \vdash 2d} \langle M^\lambda(p_1^{(n)}, \dots, p_{2d}^{(n)}), Q_n^\lambda \rangle.$$

Let  $\mathcal{K}_\lambda \subset \mathbb{R}[x]_{n,2d}^{m_\lambda \times m_\lambda}$  be the convex cone of sums squares matrices:

$$\mathcal{K}_\lambda = \left\{ M \in \mathbb{R}[x]_{n,2d}^{m_\lambda \times m_\lambda} \mid M = L^t L, \text{ } L \text{ matrix polynomial with entries in } \mathbb{R}[x]_{n,d} \right\}.$$

Let  $\mathcal{K} = \bigoplus_{\lambda \vdash 2d} \mathcal{K}_\lambda \subset \bigoplus_{\lambda \vdash 2d} \mathbb{R}[x]_{n,2d}^{m_\lambda \times m_\lambda}$ . It follows from Corollary 4.8 that the cone  $\Sigma_{n,2d}^S$  is the image in  $H_{n,2d}$  of the linear projection  $\mathcal{L}_n(\mathcal{K})$ :

$$\Sigma_{n,2d}^S = \mathcal{L}_n(\mathcal{K}) \cap H_{n,2d}.$$

We have shown in Proposition 4.9 that for every  $\lambda \vdash 2d$  the sequence  $Q_n^\lambda$ , when viewed in the basis  $p_\mu^{(n)}$  converges to the matrix  $Q_\infty^\lambda$ , which therefore gives rise to the limiting linear projection operator  $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ :

$$\mathcal{L}_\infty : \bigoplus_{\lambda \vdash 2d} \mathbb{R}[x]_{n,2d}^{m_\lambda \times m_\lambda} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}[x], \quad \mathcal{L}_\infty(\bigoplus_{\lambda \vdash 2d} M^\lambda) = \sum_{\lambda \vdash 2d} \langle M^\lambda(p_1^{(n)}, \dots, p_{2d}^{(n)}), Q_\infty^\lambda \rangle.$$

We claim that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Sigma_{n,2d}^S = \mathcal{L}_\infty(\mathcal{K}). \quad (4.5)$$

It is clear from (4.4) that for every  $n$  the map  $\mathcal{L}_n$  does not send any nontrivial matrix in  $\mathcal{K}$  to 0, since it simply sends the matrix polynomial to the corresponding sum of squares. Thus we see that for all  $n$

$$\ker \mathcal{L}_n \cap \mathcal{K} = 0.$$

Since the cone  $\mathcal{K}$  is a closed convex cone, the claim in (4.5) will follow if we can show that  $\ker \mathcal{L}_\infty \cap \mathcal{K} = 0$ . Suppose that there exists  $\bigoplus_{\lambda \vdash 2d} P^\lambda \in \ker \mathcal{L}_\infty \cap \mathcal{K}$ . We have from (4.4)

$$\mathcal{L}_n(\bigoplus_{\lambda \vdash 2d} P^\lambda) = \sum_{\lambda \vdash 2d} \langle P^\lambda(p_1^{(n)}, \dots, p_{2d}^{(n)}), Q_n^\lambda \rangle = \sum_{\lambda \vdash 2d} \text{sym}_n \left( L_\lambda \left( p_1^{(n)}, \dots, p_{2d}^{(n)} \right) q_\lambda \right)^t L_\lambda \left( p_1^{(n)}, \dots, p_{2d}^{(n)} \right) q_\lambda.$$

For every partition  $\lambda \vdash 2d$  consider polynomial

$$G_n^\lambda = \langle P^\lambda(p_1^{(n)}, \dots, p_{2d}^{(n)}), Q_n^\lambda \rangle.$$

Since we have

$$\mathcal{L}_\infty(\bigoplus_{\lambda \vdash 2d} P^\lambda) = 0$$

it follows that, when viewed as a vector of coefficients in the basis  $p_\mu^{(n)}$ ,

$$G_n^\lambda \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Suppose that  $n = k \cdot 2d$  and let  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_2, \dots, x_{2d}, \dots, x_{2d})$ , where each variable  $x_i$  occurs exactly  $k$  times. Consider the following form  $\bar{G}_n \in H_{2d,2d}^S$

$$\bar{G}_n = G_n^\lambda(\mathbf{x}).$$

The key observation is that for every partition  $\mu \vdash a$  with  $a \leq 2d$  we have:

$$p_\mu^{(n)}(\mathbf{x}) = p_\mu^{(2d)}(x_1, \dots, x_{2d}).$$

Thus we have  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \bar{G}_n = 0$  and

$$\bar{G}_n(x_1, \dots, x_{2d}) = G_n^\lambda(\mathbf{x}) = \langle P^\lambda(p_1^{(n)}, \dots, p_{2d}^{(n)}), Q_n^\lambda \rangle(\mathbf{x}) = \langle P^\lambda(p_1^{(2d)}, \dots, p_{2d}^{(2d)}), Q_n^\lambda(\mathbf{x}) \rangle.$$

Recall from Corollary 4.7 that

$$Q_n^\lambda = \text{sym}_n Q_{2d} \quad \text{and therefore} \quad \bar{G}_n(x_1, \dots, x_{2d}) = \langle P^\lambda(p_1^{(2d)}, \dots, p_{2d}^{(2d)}), (\text{sym}_n Q_{2d}^\lambda)(\mathbf{x}) \rangle$$

We observe that

$$G_{2d}^\lambda = \langle P^\lambda(p_1^{(2d)}, \dots, p_{2d}^{(2d)}), Q_{2d}^\lambda \rangle.$$

The form  $\bar{G}_n$  is by construction a sum of squares and we claim that

$$\bar{G}_n - \frac{k^k}{\binom{2kd}{2d}} G_{2d}^\lambda$$

is also a sum of squares. For this we examine  $(\text{sym}_n Q_{2d}^\lambda)(\mathbf{x})$ . Since every entry of  $Q_{2d}^\lambda$  is a function of at most  $2d$  variables, it follows that the proportion of permutations  $\sigma$  in  $\mathcal{S}_{2kd}$  for which we have

$$(Q_{2d}^\lambda(\sigma x))(\mathbf{x}) = Q_{2d}^\lambda(x)$$

is at least

$$\frac{k^k (2d)! (2kd - 2d)!}{(2kd)!} = \frac{k^k}{\binom{2kd}{2d}},$$

since there are  $\binom{2kd}{2d}$  ways of choosing  $2d$  elements from  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $k^k$  choices lead to choosing precisely  $x_1, \dots, x_{2d}$ .

Since

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{k^k}{\binom{2kd}{2d}} > 0,$$

we see that  $\bar{G}_n$  does not tend to 0 as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  which is a contradiction and the claim in (4.5) is proved.

Now that we have established existence of the limit of the sequence  $\Sigma_{n,2d}^S$  we recall from Remark 3.6 that  $\Sigma_{\ell,n,2d}^S \subseteq \Sigma_{n,2d}^S$  and therefore it follows that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Sigma_{n,2d}^S = \bigcap_{n=2d}^{\infty} \Sigma_{n,2d}^S.$$

□

## 5. THE CONES $\mathfrak{P}_{2d}$ AND $\mathfrak{S}_{2d}$

We observe that Theorem 1.1 implies that the cones  $\mathfrak{P}_{2d}$  and  $\mathfrak{S}_{2d}$  are closed, pointed convex cones. A priori it is not clear that these cones are full dimensional. We establish this by considering a subcone of  $\Sigma_{n,2d}^S$ . Let  $T$  be the  $\mathcal{S}_n$ -submodule of  $H_{n,d}$  generated (under the action of  $\mathcal{S}_n$ ) by the symmetric forms and forms

$$(x_1^a - x_2^a)f \quad \text{with} \quad f \in H_{n,d-a}^S \quad \text{and} \quad a \in \{1, \dots, d\}.$$

Denote by  $\Sigma_{n,2d}^{S'}$  be the cone of symmetric sums of squares of forms in  $T$ . We now apply techniques developed in Section 4 to study the cone  $\Sigma_{n,2d}^{S'}$ . By Proposition 4.4 the polynomial  $sp_{(n-1,1)} := (x_1 - x_2)$  generates an irreducible representation isomorphic to  $S^{(n-1,1)}$ . It follows therefore that  $T$  has two isotypic components:

$$T = V^{(1)} \oplus V^{(2)},$$

with  $V^{(1)}$  corresponding to the trivial representation and  $V^{(2)}$  to the representation  $S^{(n-1,1)}$ . The set  $\{p_\lambda, \lambda \vdash d\}$  is a basis of the space of symmetric forms of degree  $d$ , thus it is also a symmetry basis of  $V^{(1)}$ .

For every  $a \in \{1, \dots, d\}$  and  $\mu \vdash d - a$  (we allow here that the empty partition is a partition of 0) we consider the form

$$h_{a,\mu} := (x_1^a - x_2^a) \cdot p_\mu.$$

Each  $h_{a,\mu}$  generates  $\mathcal{S}_n$ -module  $W_{a,\mu}$  which is isomorphic to the irreducible representation  $S^{(n-1,1)}$ . The modules  $W_{a,\mu}$  decompose  $V^{(2)}$ :

$$V^{(2)} = \oplus_{a,\mu} W_{a,\mu}.$$

Furthermore  $\mathcal{S}_n$  acts on every  $h_{a,\mu}$  in exactly the same way, or in other words  $h_{b,\mu_2}$  is the image of  $h_{a,\mu_1}$  under the unique (up to a constant multiple)  $\mathcal{S}_n$ -isomorphism between  $W_{a,\mu_1}$  and  $W_{b,\mu_2}$ . Therefore we see that the forms  $h_{a,\mu}$ ,  $a = 1, \dots, d$  form a symmetry basis of  $V^{(2)}$ .

We observe that with  $a, b \in \{1, \dots, d\}$  and  $\mu_1 \vdash d - a, \mu_2 \vdash d - b$  we have

$$\frac{n-1}{2n} \text{sym}_n(h_{a,\mu_1} \cdot h_{b,\mu_2}) = (p_{a+b} - p_a p_b) p_{\mu_1} p_{\mu_2}. \quad (5.1)$$

We now have all the ingredients to apply Corollary 4.2 to  $T$ . Let  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{\pi(d)}$  denote all partitions of  $d$  and for  $a \in \{1, \dots, d\}$  let  $\mu_1^a, \dots, \mu_{\pi(d-a)}^a$  denote all partitions of  $d - a$ .

(1) Define the matrix  $A \in \mathbb{R}[p_1, \dots, p_d]^{\pi(d) \times \pi(d)}$  by

$$A_{i,j} := p_{\lambda_i} \cdot p_{\lambda_j}.$$

(2) Define a block matrix  $B$  with blocks  $B_{a,b} \in \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]^{\pi(d-a) \times \pi(d-b)}$  indexed by  $a, b \in \{1, \dots, d\}$  and defined by

$$(B_{a,b})_{i,j} = p_{\mu_i^a} p_{\mu_j^b} (p_{a+b} - p_a p_b).$$

Then by applying Corollary 4.2, we obtain the following:

**Lemma 5.1.**  $\Sigma_{n,2d}^{S'}$  is the cone of polynomials  $f \in H_{n,2d}^S$  that admit a representation of the form

$$f = \langle Q_1, A \rangle + \langle Q_2, B \rangle,$$

where  $Q_1$  and  $Q_2$  are positive semidefinite matrices with real entries.

We observe that it follows from the above Lemma (and equation (5.1) is the crucial ingredient) that the cone  $\Sigma_{n,2d}^{S'}$  is independent of  $n$  when regarded as a subset of  $\mathbb{R}^{\pi(2d)}$  using the basis  $p_\lambda^{(n)}$ . We now use this feature of  $\Sigma_{n,2d}^{S'}$  to prove full-dimensionality of  $\mathfrak{S}_{2d}$ .

**Lemma 5.2.** The cone  $\Sigma_{n,2d}^{S'}$  has full dimension in  $\mathbb{R}^{\pi(2d)}$ .

*Proof.* It suffices to show that polynomials

$$p_{\mu_1} p_{\mu_2} \quad \text{with } \mu_1, \mu_2 \vdash d, \quad (5.2)$$

and

$$\frac{n-1}{2n} \text{sym}_n(h_{a,\mu_1} \cdot h_{b,\mu_2}) = (p_{a+b} - p_a p_b) p_{\mu_1} p_{\mu_2} \quad \text{with } \mu_1 \vdash d - a, \mu_2 \vdash d - b \quad (5.3)$$

span  $H_{n,2d}^S$ , i.e. we need to show that every  $p_\lambda$ ,  $\lambda \vdash 2d$  is in the span of the forms above.

Given  $k, m \in \mathbb{N}$ , we say that a partition  $\mu \vdash k$  is a subpartition of  $\lambda \vdash m$ , if we can obtain  $\mu$  from  $\lambda$  by deleting some parts of  $\lambda$ . We distinguish two types of partitions  $\lambda \vdash 2d$ : those for which we can identify a subpartition  $\mu$  of  $d$  and the remaining ones which do not contain a subpartition of  $d$ . For partitions in the first group we have

$$p_\lambda = p_{\mu_1} p_{\mu_2} \quad \text{for some } \mu_1, \mu_2 \vdash d,$$

and by (5.2) such  $p_\lambda$  are in the desired span.

Now suppose that  $\lambda \vdash 2d$  does not contain a subpartition of  $d$ . We observe that with the above argument and equation (5.3) it suffices to show that we can write

$$p_\lambda = p_{a+b} p_{\mu_1} p_{\mu_2} \quad \text{with } 1 \leq a, b \leq d, \mu_1 \vdash d - a, \mu_2 \vdash d - b.$$

Let  $0 \leq k \leq d - 1$  be maximal subject to  $\lambda$  containing a subpartition of  $k$ , i.e.  $p_\lambda = p_{\mu_1} \cdot p_\nu$  such that  $\mu_1 \vdash k \leq d - 1$ ,  $\nu \vdash 2d - k \geq d + 1$ . Since  $k$  was chosen maximally,  $\nu$  contains a part  $h$  with  $0 < h \leq 2d - k$  such that  $2d - k - h < d$ . Therefore  $p_\nu = p_h \cdot p_{\mu_2}$  where  $\mu_2 \vdash 2d - k - h$ . Setting  $a = d - k$  and  $b = k + h - d$  we arrive at the announced  $p_\lambda = p_{a+b} p_{\mu_1} p_{\mu_2}$ .

□

We are now ready to prove full-dimensionality of the cones  $\mathfrak{P}_{2d}$  and  $\mathfrak{S}_{2d}$ .

*Proof of Theorem 1.2.* Define

$$\mathfrak{S}'_{2d} := \bigcap_{n \geq 2d} \Sigma_{n,2d}^{S'}$$

The description of  $\Sigma_{n,2d}^{S'}$  as a subset of  $\mathbb{R}^{\pi(d)}$  does not change with  $n$ . The theorem follows from the following chain of inclusions and Lemma 5.2:

$$\mathfrak{S}'_{2d} \subset \mathfrak{S}_{2d} \subseteq \mathfrak{P}_{2d}.$$

□

Let  $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$  denote the unit sphere in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and let  $\mathcal{L}_n : H_{n,2d}^S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a linear functional given by:

$$\mathcal{L}_n(f) = n^d \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f d\sigma,$$

where  $\sigma$  is the rotation invariant probability measure on the unit sphere. The normalization factor  $n^d$  is chosen for convenience such that  $\mathcal{L}_n(p_\lambda)$  is asymptotically constant for an even partition  $\lambda$  of  $2d$ , i.e. partition  $\lambda \vdash 2d$  with all even parts. Let  $I_n$  be the affine hyperplane in  $H_{n,2d}^S$  given by

$$I_n = \{f \in H_{n,2d}^S \mid \mathcal{L}_n(f) = 1\}.$$

The sections of  $\mathcal{P}_{n,2d}^S$  and  $\Sigma_{n,2d}^S$  with  $I_n$  are compact. The ratio of the volumes of the resulting sections is a measure of the difference of the size of the two cones. To this end we define

$$v_{\mathcal{P}(n,2d)} := \text{vol}(\mathcal{P}_{n,2d} \cap I_n) \quad \text{and} \quad v_{\Sigma(n,2d)} := \text{vol}(\Sigma_{n,2d} \cap I_n).$$

By combining Theorem 1.1 with Theorem 1.2 we get

**Corollary 5.3.** *The limit  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{v_{\Sigma(n,2d)}}{v_{\mathcal{P}(n,2d)}}$  exists and is strictly positive.*

In view of the results in [2] the above Corollary shows that asymptotically the situation with symmetric sums of squares is much nicer. In the remainder of the paper we aim to prove that the situation is particularly nice in the case of quartics.

## 6. SYMMETRIC SUMS OF SQUARES IN DEGREE 4

We now look at the decomposition of  $H_{n,2}$  as an  $\mathcal{S}_n$ -module in order to apply Theorem 4.1 and characterize all symmetric sums of squares of degree 4.

**Theorem 6.1.** *Let  $f^{(n)} \in H_{n,4}$  be symmetric and  $n \geq 4$ . Then if  $f^{(n)}$  is a sum of squares it can be written in the form*

$$\begin{aligned} f^{(n)} = & \alpha_{11}p_{(1^4)} + 2\alpha_{12}p_{(2,1^2)} + \alpha_{22}p_{(2^2)} + \beta_{11}(p_{(2,1^2)} - p_{(1^4)}) + 2\beta_{12}(p_{(3,1)} - p_{(2,1^2)}) + \beta_{22}(p_{(4)} - p_{(2^2)}) \\ & + \gamma \left( \frac{1}{2}p_{(1^4)} - p_{(2,1^2)} + \frac{n^2-3n+3}{2n^2}p_{(2^2)} + \frac{2n-2}{n^2}p_{(31)} + \frac{1-n}{2n^2}p_{(4)} \right) \end{aligned}$$

such that  $\gamma \geq 0$  and the matrices  $\begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{11} & \alpha_{12} \\ \alpha_{12} & \alpha_{22} \end{pmatrix}$  and  $\begin{pmatrix} \beta_{11} & \beta_{12} \\ \beta_{12} & \beta_{22} \end{pmatrix}$  are positive semidefinite.

*Proof.* The statement can be deduced using the arguments presented in section 4.3. We find that  $\mathcal{H}_{S_4,2}$  contains the polynomials 1,  $x_1 - x_2$ ,  $x_1^2 - x_2^2$ ,  $(x_1 - x_2)(x_3 - x_4)$ . Each of these polynomials generates a distinct irreducible  $\mathcal{S}_4$  module, one of which is isomorphic to the trivial representation  $S^{(4)}$ , two are

isomorphic to  $S^{(3,1)}$ , and one isomorphic to  $S^{(2,2)}$ . It follows that two of the needed matrices are  $1 \times 1$  and one is  $2 \times 2$ . Explicit calculation shows that

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_n^{(n)} &= 1, \\
Q_n^{(n-1,1)} &= \begin{pmatrix} \text{sym}_n((x_1 - x_2)^2) & \text{sym}_n((x_1 - x_2)(x_1^2 - x_2^2)) \\ \text{sym}_n((x_1 - x_2)(x_1^2 - x_2^2)) & \text{sym}_n((x_1^2 - x_2^2)^2) \end{pmatrix} \\
&= \frac{2n}{n-1} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} p_{(2)} - p_{(1^2)} & p_{(3)} - p_{(2,1)} \\ p_{(3)} - p_{(2,1)} & p_{(4)} - p_{(2^2)} \end{pmatrix}, \\
Q_n^{(n-2,2)} &= \text{sym}_n((x_1 - x_2)^2(x_3 - x_4)^2) \\
&= \frac{8n^3}{(n-1)(n-2)(n-3)} \left( \frac{1}{2}p_{(1^4)} - p_{(2,1^2)} + \frac{n^2 - 3n + 3}{2n^2}p_{(2^2)} + \frac{2n-2}{n^2}p_{(3,1)} + \frac{1-n}{2n^2}p_{(4)} \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{6.1}$$

We remark that an easy way to perform these calculations is to express the polynomials in the weighted monomial basis as in the proof of Proposition 4.9 and then convert back into the weighted power sum basis using the transition formula given in the proof of the Proposition.

With these equations it follows from Corollary 4.8 that  $f^{(n)}$  has a decomposition:

$$f^{(n)} = P^{(n)} + \langle P^{(n-1,1)}, Q_n^{(n-1,1)} \rangle + P^{(n-2,2)} \cdot Q_n^{(n-2,2)},$$

where  $P^{(n)}$  is a sum of symmetric squares,  $P^{(n-1,1)}$  is a  $2 \times 2$  sum of symmetric squares matrix polynomial and due to the degree restrictions  $P^{(n-2,2)}$  is a nonnegative scalar, which gives exactly the statement in the Theorem.  $\square$

We now deduce the following Corollary completely describing polynomials belonging to  $\mathfrak{S}_4$ :

**Corollary 6.2.** *We have  $\mathfrak{f} \in \mathfrak{S}_4$  if and only if*

$$\mathfrak{f} = \alpha_{11}\mathfrak{p}_{(1^4)} + 2\alpha_{12}\mathfrak{p}_{(2,1^2)} + \alpha_{22}\mathfrak{p}_{(2^2)} + \beta_{11}(\mathfrak{p}_{(2,1^2)} - \mathfrak{p}_{(1^4)}) + 2\beta_{12}(\mathfrak{p}_{(3,1)} - \mathfrak{p}_{(2,1^2)}) + \beta_{22}(\mathfrak{p}_{(4)} - \mathfrak{p}_{(2^2)}),$$

where the matrices  $\begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{11} & \alpha_{12} \\ \alpha_{12} & \alpha_{22} \end{pmatrix}$  and  $\begin{pmatrix} \beta_{11} & \beta_{12} \\ \beta_{12} & \beta_{22} \end{pmatrix}$  are positive semidefinite. .

*Proof.* We observe from Theorem 6.1 that the coefficients of the squares of symmetric polynomials and of  $(n-1,1)$  semi-invariants do not depend on  $n$ . Thus the cone generated by these sums of squares is the same for any  $n$ , and it corresponds precisely to the cone given in the statement of the Corollary. Now observe that the limit of the square of the  $(n-2,2)$  component is equal to  $\frac{1}{2}\mathfrak{p}_{(1^4)} - \mathfrak{p}_{(2,1^2)} + \frac{1}{2}\mathfrak{p}_{(2^2)}$ , which is a sum of symmetric squares. Thus the squares from the  $(n-2,2)$  component do not contribute anything in the limit.  $\square$

**6.1. The boundary of  $\Sigma_{n,4}^S$ .** Now we analyze the difference of the boundaries of  $\Sigma_{n,4}^S$  and  $\mathcal{P}_{n,4}^S$ , in particular we characterize the facets (i.e. maximal faces) of the cone  $\Sigma_{n,4}^S$  which are not facets of the cone  $\mathcal{P}_{n,4}^S$ . The existence of such facets is equivalent to  $\Sigma_{n,4}^S \neq \mathcal{P}_{n,4}^S$ . The key to this examination of the boundary is the dual correspondence: Recall, that for a convex cone  $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  the dual cone  $K^*$  is defined as

$$K^* := \{\ell \in \text{Hom}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}) : \ell(x) \geq 0 \quad \text{for all } x \in K\}.$$

The dual correspondence yields that any facet  $F$  of  $K$ , i.e. any maximal face of  $K$ , is given by an extreme ray of  $K^*$ . More precisely, for any maximal face  $F$  of  $K$  there exists an extreme ray of  $K^*$  spanned by a linear functional  $\ell \in K^*$  such that

$$F = \{x \in K : \text{such that } \ell(x) = 0\}.$$

Our analysis of the dual cone  $(\Sigma_{n,2d}^S)^*$  proceeds similarly to the analysis of the dual cone in the non-symmetric situation given in [3].

Let  $S_{n,d}$  be the vector space of real quadratic forms on  $H_{n,d}$ . Let  $S_{n,d}^+$  be the cone of positive semidefinite matrices in  $S_{n,d}$ . An element  $Q \in S_{n,d}$  is said to be  $\mathcal{S}_n$ -invariant if  $Q(f) = Q(\sigma(f))$  for all  $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_n$ ,  $f \in H_{n,d}$ .

We will denote by  $\bar{S}_{n,d}$  the space of  $\mathcal{S}_n$ -invariant quadratic forms on  $H_{n,d}$ . Further we can identify a linear functional  $\ell \in (H_{n,2d}^S)^*$  with a quadratic form  $Q_\ell$  defined by

$$Q_\ell(f) = \ell(\text{sym}(f^2)).$$

Let  $\bar{S}_{n,d}^+$  be the cone of positive semidefinite forms in  $\bar{S}_{n,d}$ , i.e.,

$$\bar{S}_{n,d}^+ := \{Q \in \bar{S}_{n,d} : Q(f) \geq 0 \text{ for all } f \in H_{n,d}\}.$$

The following Lemma is straightforward but very important as it allows us to identify the elements of dual cone  $\ell \in (\Sigma_{n,2d}^S)^*$  with quadratic forms  $Q_\ell$  in  $\bar{S}_{n,d}^+$ .

**Lemma 6.3.** *A linear functional  $\ell \in (H_{n,2d}^S)^*$  belongs to the dual cone  $(\Sigma_{n,2d}^S)^*$  if and only if the quadratic form  $Q_\ell$  is positive semidefinite.*

We aim to characterize the extreme rays of  $(\Sigma_{n,4}^S)^*$  which are not extreme rays of the cone  $(\mathcal{P}_{n,4}^S)^*$ . For  $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$  define a linear functional

$$\ell_v : H_{n,2d}^S \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \quad \ell_v(f) = f(v).$$

We say that the linear functional  $\ell_v$  corresponds to point evaluation at  $v$ . It is easy to show with the same proof as in the non-symmetric case that the extreme rays of the cone  $(\mathcal{P}_{n,4}^S)^*$  are precisely the point evaluations  $\ell_v$  (see [4, Chapter 4] for the non-symmetric case). Therefore we need to identify extreme rays of  $(\Sigma_{n,4}^S)^*$  which are not point evaluations.

In Lemma 6.3 we identified the dual cone  $(\Sigma_{n,2d}^S)^*$  with a linear section of the cone of positive semidefinite quadratic forms  $\bar{S}_{n,d}^+$  with the subspace  $\bar{S}_{n,d}$  of symmetric quadratic forms. By a slight abuse of terminology we think of positive semidefinite forms  $Q_\ell$  as elements of the dual cone  $(\Sigma_{n,2d}^S)^*$ . We use the following general result on extreme rays of sections of the cone of psd matrices. Let  $S$  be the vector space of quadratic forms on a real vector space  $V$  and  $S^+$  be the cone of positive semidefinite forms on  $V$ . The following Lemma is from [16, Corollary 4]:

**Lemma 6.4.** *Let  $L$  be a linear subspace of  $S$  and let  $K$  be the section of  $S^+$  with  $L$ , i.e.,*

$$K := S^+ \cap L.$$

*Then a quadratic form  $Q \in K$  spans an extreme ray of  $K$  if and only if its kernel  $\text{Ker } Q$  is maximal for all forms in  $L$ , i.e., if  $\text{Ker } Q \subseteq \text{Ker } P$  we must have  $P = \lambda Q$  for some  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ .*

In order to examine the kernels of quadratic forms we use the following construction. Let  $W \subset H_{n,d}$  be any linear subspace. We define  $W^{<2>}$  to be the symmetrization of the degree  $2d$  part of the ideal generated by  $W$ :

$$W^{<2>} := \left\{ h \in H_{n,2d}^S : h = \text{sym} \left( \sum f_i g_i \right) \text{ with } f_i \in W \text{ and } g_i \in H_{n,d} \right\}.$$

We use the following straightforward Proposition to characterize the elements in the kernels of the quadratic forms in  $(\Sigma_{n,2d}^S)^*$ .

**Proposition 6.5.** *Let  $Q_\ell$  be a quadratic form in  $(\Sigma_{n,2d}^S)^*$  and let  $W_\ell \subset H_{n,d}$  be the kernel of  $Q_\ell$ . Then  $p \in W_\ell$  if and only if  $\ell(\text{sym}(pq)) = 0$  for all  $q \in H_{n,d}$ . In particular  $\ell(f) = 0$  for all  $f \in W_\ell^{<2>}$ .*

Combining Lemma 6.4 and Proposition 6.5 we obtain the following corollary:

**Corollary 6.6.** *Let  $\ell \in (\Sigma_{n,2d}^S)^*$  be a linear functional nonnegative on squares and let  $W_\ell \subset H_{n,d}$  be the kernel of the quadratic form  $Q_\ell$ . The linear functional  $\ell$  spans an extreme ray of  $(\Sigma_{n,2d}^S)^*$  if and only if  $W_\ell^{<2>}$  is a hyperplane in  $H_{n,2d}^S$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose that  $\ell$  spans an extreme ray of  $(\Sigma_{n,2d}^S)^*$  and  $W_\ell^{<2>}$  is not a hyperplane. Then there exists a linear functional  $m \in (H_{n,2d}^S)^*$  such that  $m(f) = 0$  for all  $f \in W_\ell^{<2>}$  and  $m$  is linearly independent from  $\ell$ . By Proposition 6.5 we have  $W \subseteq \text{ker } m$ . This is a contradiction by Lemma 6.4.

Now suppose that  $W_\ell^{<2>}$  is a hyperplane for some  $\ell \in (\Sigma_{n,2d}^S)^*$ , but  $\ell$  does not span an extreme ray. Then we can write  $2\ell = m_1 + m_2$  for  $m_1, m_2 \in (\Sigma_{n,2d}^S)^*$  with  $m_1, m_2$  not equal to a multiple of  $\ell$ . It follows that  $\ker Q_\ell \subseteq \ker m_1$ . Therefore by Proposition 6.5 we have  $m_1(f) = 0$  for all  $f \in W_\ell^{<2>}$ . Since  $W_\ell^{<2>}$  is a hyperplane we see that  $m_1$  is a multiple of  $\ell$  which is a contradiction.  $\square$

We now examine the possible kernels of an extreme ray of  $(\Sigma_{n,4}^S)^*$  which does not come from a point evaluation.

**Lemma 6.7.** *Suppose a linear functional  $\ell$  spans an extreme ray of  $(\Sigma_{n,4}^S)^*$  which is not an extreme ray of  $(\mathcal{P}_{n,4}^S)^*$ . Let  $Q$  be quadratic form corresponding to  $\ell$ . Then*

$$\text{Ker } Q \simeq S^{(n)} \oplus S^{(n-1,1)},$$

or

$$\ell \left( \sum_{\lambda \vdash 4} c_\lambda p_\lambda \right) = c_{(4)} + c_{(2^2)}$$

and  $n$  is odd.

*Proof.* Since  $Q$  is an  $\mathcal{S}_n$ -invariant quadratic form, its kernel  $\text{Ker } Q \subseteq H_{n,2}$  is an  $\mathcal{S}_n$ -module. It follows from the arguments in the proof of Theorem 6.1 that  $\text{Ker } Q$  decomposes as

$$\text{Ker } Q \simeq \alpha \cdot S^{(n)} \bigoplus \beta \cdot S^{(n-1,1)} \bigoplus \gamma \cdot S^{(n-2,2)},$$

where  $\alpha, \beta \in \{0, 1, 2\}$  and  $\gamma \in \{0, 1\}$ . We now examine the possible combinations of  $\alpha, \beta$  and  $\gamma$ .

As above let  $W$  denote the kernel of  $Q$ . We first observe that  $\alpha = 2$  is not possible: if  $\alpha = 2$  then we have  $p_2 \in W$  which implies  $p_2^2 \in W_S^{<2>}$ , which is a contradiction since  $p_2^2$  is not on the boundary of  $\Sigma_{n,4}^S$ .

By Lemma 6.4 the kernel  $W$  of  $Q$  must be maximal. Let  $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$  be the all 1 vector:  $w = (1, \dots, 1)$ . We now observe that  $\alpha = 0$  is also not possible: if  $\alpha = 0$  then all forms in the kernel  $W$  of  $Q$  are 0 at  $w$ . Therefore  $\ker Q \subseteq \ker Q_{\ell_w}$  and by Lemma 6.4 we have  $Q = \lambda Q_{\ell_w}$ , which is a contradiction, since  $Q$  does not correspond to point evaluation. Thus we must have  $\alpha = 1$ .

Since we have  $\dim H_{n,4}^S = 5$  from Corollary 6.6 we see that  $\dim W^{<2>} = 4$ . This excludes the case  $\beta = 0$ , since even with  $\alpha = 1$  and  $\gamma = 1$  the dimension of  $W^{<2>}$  is at most 3. Now suppose that  $\beta = 2$ , i.e. the  $\mathcal{S}_n$ -module generated by  $(x_1 - x_2)p_1$  and  $x_1^2 - x_2^2$  lies in  $W$  as well as a polynomial  $q = ap_1^2 + bp_2$ . From (6.1) we calculate the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{sym}_n((x_1^2 - x_2^2)^2) &= \frac{2n}{n-1}(p_{(4)} - p_{(2^2)}) \\ \text{sym}_n((x_1^2 - x_2^2)(x_1 - x_2)^2 p_1) &= \frac{2n}{n-1}(p_{(3,1)} - p_{(2,1^2)}) \\ \text{sym}_n((x_1 - x_2)^2 p_1^2) &= \frac{2n}{n-1}(p_{(2,1^2)} - p_{(1^4)}) \\ \text{sym}_n(p_1^2(ap_1^2 + bp_2)) &= ap_{(1^4)} + bp_{(2,1^2)} \\ \text{sym}_n(p_2(ap_1^2 + bp_2)) &= ap_{(2,1^2)} + bp_{(2^2)}. \end{aligned} \tag{6.2}$$

Order the basis of  $H_{n,2}^S$  as  $p_{(4)}, p_{(3,1)}, p_{(2^2)}, p_{(2,1^2)}, p_{(1^4)}$ . Let  $M$  be the matrix whose rows are given by the right hand side vectors above (up to a constant factor):

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & b & a \\ 0 & 0 & b & a & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

Since  $\dim W^{<2>} = 4$  we must have  $\det M = b(a+b) = 0$ . However if  $a = -b$  then all polynomials in  $W$  (even if  $\gamma = 1$ ) will be zero at  $(1, \dots, 1)$ , which as we saw above is a contradiction. Therefore the only possible

case is  $b = 0$ . In that case, by calculating the kernel of  $M$  we see that the unique (up to a constant multiple) linear functional  $\ell$  vanishing on  $W^{<2>}$  is given by

$$\ell \left( \sum_{\lambda \vdash 4} c_\lambda p_\lambda \right) = c_{(4)} + c_{(2^2)}.$$

We observe using (6.1) that we must have  $\gamma = 0$  since  $\ell(\text{sym}_n(x_1 - x_2)^2(x_3 - x_4)^2) > 0$  for  $n \geq 4$ . Now suppose that  $n$  is even and let  $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$  be given by  $w = (1, \dots, 1, -1, \dots, -1)$  where 1 and  $-1$  occur  $n/2$  times each. It is easy to verify that for all  $f \in W$  we have  $f(w) = 0$ . Therefore it follows that  $W \subseteq \ker Q_{\ell_w}$ , which is a contradiction by Lemma 6.4, since  $W$  is a kernel of an extreme ray which does not come from point evaluation.

When  $n$  is odd the forms in  $W$  have no common zeroes and therefore  $\ell$  is not a positive combination of point evaluations. It is not hard to verify that  $\ell$  is nonnegative on squares and the kernel  $W$  is maximal. Therefore by Lemma 6.4 we know that  $\ell$  spans an extreme ray of  $(\Sigma_{n,2d}^S)^*$ .

Finally we need to deal with the case  $\alpha = \beta = \gamma = 1$ . Suppose that the  $\mathcal{S}_n$ -module  $W$  is generated by three polynomials:

$$q_1 := ap_1^2 + bp_2, \quad q_2 := c(x_1 - x_2)p_1 + d(x_1^2 - x_2^2), \quad q_3 = (x_1 - x_2)(x_3 - x_4).$$

with  $a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{R}$ . Then using the above equations for symmetrizations we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{sym}_n(p_1^2 q_1) &= ap_{(1^4)} + bp_{(2,1^2)} \\ \text{sym}_n(p_2 q_1) &= ap_{(2,1^2)} + bp_{(2^2)} \\ \frac{n-1}{2n} \text{sym}_n((x_1^2 - x_2^2)q_2) &= c(p_{(3,1)} - p_{(2,1^2)}) + d(p_{(4)} - p_{(2^2)}) \\ \frac{n-1}{2n} \text{sym}_n((x_1 - x_2)p_1 q_2) &= c(p_{(2,1^2)} - p_{(1^4)}) + d(p_{(3,1)} - p_{(2,1^2)}) \\ \frac{(n-1)(n-2)(n-3)}{8n^3} \text{sym}_n(q_3^2) &= \frac{1}{2}p_{(1^4)} - p_{(2,1^2)} + \frac{n^2 - 3n + 3}{2n^2}p_{(2^2)} + \frac{1-n}{2n^2}p_{(4)} + \frac{2n-2}{n^2}p_{(3,1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Again Let  $M$  be the matrix whose rows are given by the right hand side vectors above (up to a constant factor):

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & b & a \\ 0 & 0 & b & a & 0 \\ d & c & -d & -c & 0 \\ 0 & d & 0 & c-d & -c \\ 1-n & 4n-4 & n^2-3n+3 & -2n^2 & n^2 \end{pmatrix}$$

We calculate

$$\det M = -(a+b)(ad^2n^2 - 4ad^2n + 4ad^2 + bd^2n^2 + 4bcdn + bc^2n - 4bcd - bc^2).$$

Since we have  $\alpha = \beta = \gamma = 1$  we must have  $\text{rank } M = 4$  since the rows of  $M$  generate  $W^{<2>}$ . Again we cannot have  $a = -b$ , and thus we must have:

$$ad^2n^2 - 4ad^2n + 4ad^2 + bd^2n^2 + 4bcdn + bc^2n - 4bcd - bc^2 = 0 \quad (6.3)$$

Therefore there exists a unique linear functional  $\ell$ , which vanishes on  $W^{<2>}$  and  $\ell$  comes from the kernel of  $M$ .

Let  $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$  be a point with coordinates  $w = (s, \dots, s, t)$  with  $s, t \in \mathbb{R}$ , such that they satisfy:

$$cn(s+t) + d((n-1)s+t) = 0.$$

We see that  $q_3(w) = 0$  and from the above equation it also follows that for all  $f$  in the  $\mathcal{S}_n$ -module generated by  $q_2$  we have  $f(w) = 0$ . Direct calculation shows that (6.3) also implies that  $q_1(w) = 0$ . Thus we have  $W \subseteq Q_{\ell_w}$ , which is a contradiction by Lemma 6.4, since  $W$  is a kernel of an extreme ray which does not come from point evaluation. We remark that it is possible to show that the functional  $\ell$  vanishing on  $W^{<2>}$  and giving rise to  $W$  is in fact a multiple of  $\ell_w$ , but this is not necessary for us to finish the proof.  $\square$

The above description allows us to explicitly characterize degree 4 symmetric sums of squares that are positive and on the boundary of  $\Sigma_{n,4}^S$ .

**Theorem 6.8.** *Let  $n \geq 4$  and  $f^{(n)} \in H_{n,4}$  be symmetric and positive and on the boundary of  $\Sigma_{4,n}^S$ . Then*

(1) *either  $f^{(n)}$  can be written as*

$$f^{(n)} = a^2 p_{(4)}^{(n)} + 2ab p_{(31)}^{(n)} + (c^2 - a^2) p_{2^2}^{(n)} + (2cd + b^2 - 2ab) p_{(2,1^2)}^{(n)} + (d^2 - b^2) p_{(1^4)}^{(n)},$$

*with non-zero coefficients  $a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$  which additionally satisfy*

$$\begin{aligned} M_{(n)} &:= \frac{1}{ac} \begin{pmatrix} -ad + bd + bc & -ad \\ -ad & ac \end{pmatrix} \succeq 0, \\ M_{(n-1,1)} &:= -\frac{c+d}{a^2 c^2} \begin{pmatrix} abc + b^2 c - a^2 d & -a^2 d \\ -a^2 d & a^2 c \end{pmatrix} \succeq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (6.4)$$

$$\text{and } M_{(n-2,2)} := (c+d) \left( (ca^2 + cab) n^2 + (b^2 c - 3cab + 3a^2 d) n - b^2 c + 3cab - 3a^2 d \right) \geq 0.$$

(2) *or additionally if  $n$  is odd then it is possible that  $f^{(n)}$  can be written as*

$$f^{(n)} = a^2 p_{(1^4)} + b_{11} (p_{(2,1^2)} - p_{(1^4)}) + 2b_{12} (p_{(3,1)} - p_{(2,1^2)}) + b_{22} (p_{(4)} - p_{(2^2)}),$$

*with coefficients  $a, b_{11}, b_{12}, b_{22} \in \mathbb{R}$  which additionally satisfy*

$$a \neq 0 \text{ and } \begin{pmatrix} b_{11} & b_{12} \\ b_{12} & b_{22} \end{pmatrix} \succ 0. \quad (6.5)$$

*Proof.* Suppose that  $f^{(n)}$  is a strictly positive form on the boundary of  $\Sigma_{4,n}^S$ . Then there exists a non-trivial functional  $\ell$  spanning an extreme ray of the dual cone  $(\Sigma_{4,n}^S)^*$  such that  $\ell(f^{(n)}) = 0$ . Let  $W_\ell \subset H_{n,2}$  denote the kernel of  $Q_\ell$ . In view of Lemma 6.7 we see that there are two possible situations that we need to take into consideration.

(1) We first assume that

$$W_\ell \simeq S^{(n)} \oplus S^{(n-1,1)}. \quad (6.6)$$

In view of (6.6) we may assume that the  $\mathcal{S}_n$ -module  $W_\ell$  is generated by two polynomials:

$$q_1 := (cp_1^2 + dp_2) \text{ and } q_2 := \frac{n-1}{2n} (a(x_1^2 - x_2^2) + b(x_1 - x_2)p_1),$$

where  $a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{R}$  are chosen such that  $(0,0) \neq (a,b)$  and  $(0,0) \neq (c,d)$ .

Let  $q \in H_{n,2}$ . By Proposition 6.5 we have

$$q \in W_\ell \text{ if and only if the } \mathcal{S}_n\text{-linear map } p \mapsto \ell(pq) \text{ is the zero map for on } H_{n,2}.$$

The dimension of the vector space of  $\mathcal{S}_n$ -invariant quadratic maps from  $H_{n,2}$  to  $\mathbb{R}$  is 5. However, since  $q \in W_\ell$  Schur's lemma implies  $\ell(q \cdot r) = 0$  for all  $r$  in the isotypic component of the type  $(n-2,2)$ . Let  $y_\lambda = \ell(p_\lambda)$ . Using (6.2) we find that coefficients  $y_\lambda$  are characterized by the following system of four linear equations:

$$\begin{aligned} \ell(\text{sym}(q_1 \cdot p_2)) &= 0 = c \cdot y_{(2^2)} + d \cdot y_{(2,1^2)} \\ \ell(\text{sym}(q_1 \cdot p_1^2)) &= 0 = c \cdot y_{(2,1^2)} + d \cdot y_{(1^4)} \\ \ell(\text{sym}(q_2 \cdot (x_1^2 - x_2^2))) &= 0 = a \cdot y_{(4)} - a \cdot y_{(2^2)} + b \cdot y_{(3,1)} - b \cdot y_{(2,1^2)} \\ \ell(\text{sym}(q_2 \cdot (x_1 - x_2)p_1)) &= 0 = a \cdot y_{(3,1)} - a \cdot y_{(2,1^2)} + b \cdot y_{(2,1^2)} - b \cdot y_{(1^4)} \end{aligned}$$

Since in addition we want that the form  $\ell \in (\Sigma_{n,d}^S)^*$  we must also take into account that the corresponding quadratic form  $Q_\ell$  has to be positive semidefinite. By Lemma 6.3 this is equivalent to checking that each of the two matrices

$$M_{(n)} := \begin{pmatrix} y_{(2^2)} & y_{(2,1^2)} \\ y_{(2,1^2)} & y_{(1^4)} \end{pmatrix}, M_{(n-1,1)} := \begin{pmatrix} y_{(4)} - y_{(2^2)} & y_{(3,1)} - y_{(2,1^2)} \\ y_{(3,1)} - y_{(2,1^2)} & y_{(2,1^2)} - y_{(1^4)} \end{pmatrix} \text{ is positive semidefinite,}$$

$$\text{and } M_{(n-2,2)} := \frac{n^2}{2}y_{(1^4)} - n^2y_{(21^2)} + (2n-2)y_{(31)} + \frac{1}{2}(n^2 - 3n + 3)y_{(2^2)} + \frac{1-n}{2}y_{(4)} \geq 0.$$

Now assuming  $a = 0$  we find that, either  $b = 0$  which is excluded, or any solution of the above linear system will have

$$y_{(2^2)} = y_{(3,1)} = y_{(2,1^2)} = y_{(1^4)}.$$

By substituting this into  $M_{(n-2,2)}$  we find that

$$\frac{1-n}{2}(y_{(4)} - y_{(2)^2}) \geq 0,$$

while from  $M_{(n-1,1)}$  we have that  $y_{(4)} - y_{(2)^2} \geq 0$ . It follows that

$$y_{(3,1)} = y_{(2,1^2)} = y_{(1^4)} = y_{(4)} = y_{(2)^2}.$$

But then we find that  $\ell$  is proportional to the functional that simply evaluates at the point  $(1, 1, 1, \dots, 1)$ , which is a contradiction since  $f^{(n)}$  is strictly positive. Thus  $a \neq 0$ .

Now suppose that  $c = 0$ . Then we find that

$$y_{(3,1)} = y_{(1^4)} = y_{(2,1^2)} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad a(y_{(4)} - y_{(2)^2}) = 0.$$

Since  $a \neq 0$  we find that the linear functional  $\ell$  is given by

$$\ell \left( \sum_{\lambda \vdash 4} c_\lambda p_\lambda \right) = c_{(4)} - c_{(2^2)}.$$

By Lemma 6.7 we must have  $n$  odd in order for  $\ell$  not to be a point evaluation and this lands us in case (2) discussed below.

Meanwhile with  $a, c \neq 0$  the solution of the linear system (up to a common multiple) is given by

$$y_{(4)} = \frac{-b^2cd - b^2c^2 + a^2d^2}{c^2a^2}, \quad y_{(2^2)} = -\frac{da - db - bc}{ca}, \quad y_{(3,1)} = \frac{d^2}{c^2}, \quad y_{(2,1^2)} = -\frac{d}{c}, \quad y_{(1^4)} = 1,$$

which then yields the matrices in (6.4).

(2) If  $n$  is odd we know from Lemma 6.7 that there is one additional case:  $f^{(n)}$  is a sum of the square  $(ap_{(11)})^2$ , and a sum of squares of elements from the isotypic component of  $H_{n,2}$  which corresponds to the representation  $S^{(n-1,1)}$ . Since  $f^{(n)}$  is strictly positive, we must have  $a \neq 0$  (otherwise  $f^{(n)}$  has a zero at  $(1, \dots, 1)$ ) and it also follows that the matrix  $\begin{pmatrix} b_{11} & b_{12} \\ b_{12} & b_{22} \end{pmatrix}$  must be strictly positive definite. Therefore we get the announced decomposition from Theorem 6.1.

□

Note that although the first symmetric counterexample by Choi and Lam in four variables gives  $\Sigma_{4,4}^S \subsetneq \mathcal{P}_{4,4}^S$  it does not immediately imply that we have strict containment for all  $n$ . However, the following example shows that this is the case. We produce a sequence of strictly positive symmetric quartics that lie on the boundary of  $\Sigma_{n,4}^S$  for all  $n$  as a witness for the strict inclusion.

**Example 6.9.** For  $n \geq 4$  consider family of polynomials

$$f^{(n)} := a^2p_{(4)}^{(n)} + 2abp_{(31)}^{(n)} + (c^2 - a^2)p_{(2^2)}^{(n)} + (2cd + b^2 - 2ab)p_{(2,1^2)}^{(n)} + (d^2 - b^2)p_{(1^4)}^{(n)},$$

where we set  $a = 1, b = -\frac{13}{10}, c = 1$  and  $d = -\frac{5}{4}$ . Further consider the linear functional  $\ell \in H_{n,4}^*$  with

$$\ell \left( p_{(4)}^{(n)} \right) = \frac{397}{200}, \quad \ell \left( p_{(2^2)}^{(n)} \right) = \frac{63}{40}, \quad \ell \left( p_{(3,1)}^{(n)} \right) = \frac{25}{16}, \quad \ell \left( p_{(2,1^2)}^{(n)} \right) = \frac{5}{4}, \quad \ell \left( p_{(1^4)}^{(n)} \right) = 1.$$

Then we have  $\ell(f^{(n)}) = 0$ . In addition the corresponding matrices become

$$M_{(n)} := \begin{pmatrix} \frac{63}{40} & \frac{5}{4} \\ \frac{5}{4} & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad M_{(n-1,1)} := \begin{pmatrix} \frac{41}{100} & \frac{5}{16} \\ \frac{5}{16} & \frac{1}{4} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{and} \quad M_{(n-2,2)} := \frac{3}{80}n^2 + \frac{21}{80}n - \frac{21}{80}.$$

These matrices are all positive semidefinite for  $n \geq 4$  and therefore we have  $\ell \in (\Sigma_{n,4}^S)^*$ . This implies that  $f^{(n)} \in \partial \Sigma_{n,4}^S$ .

Now we argue that for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  the forms  $f^{(n)}$  are strictly positive. By Corollary 3.3 it follows that  $f^{(n)}$  has a zero, if and only if there exists  $k \in \{\frac{1}{n}, \dots, \frac{n-1}{n}\}$  such that the bivariate form

$$h_k(x, y) = \Phi_f(k, 1-k, x, y) = kx^4 + (1-k)y^4 - \frac{13}{5} (kx^3 + (1-k)y^3) (kx + (1-k)y) \\ + \frac{179}{100} (kx^2 + (1-k)y^2) (kx + (1-k)y)^2 - \frac{51}{400} (kx + (1-k)y)^4$$

has a real projective zero  $(x, y)$ . Since  $f^{(n)}$  is a sum of squares and therefore nonnegative we also know that  $h_k(x, y)$  is nonnegative for all  $k \in \{\frac{1}{n}, \dots, \frac{n-1}{n}\}$ . Therefore the real projective roots of  $h_k(x, y)$  must have even multiplicity. This implies that  $h_k(x, y)$  has a real root only if its discriminant  $\delta(h_k)$  - viewed as polynomial in the parameter  $k$  - has a root in the admissible range for  $k$ . We calculate

$$\delta(h_k) := -\frac{1}{100000000} (10000 - 37399k + 37399k^2) (149k^2 - 149k + 25)^2 (k-1)^3 k^3$$

We see that  $\delta(h_k)$  is zero only for  $k \in \{0, \frac{1}{2} \pm \frac{7}{298} \sqrt{149}, \frac{1}{2} \pm \frac{51}{74798} i\sqrt{37399}\}$ . Thus we see that for all natural numbers  $n$  there is no  $k \in \{\frac{1}{n}, \dots, \frac{n-1}{n}\}$  such that  $h_k(x, y)$  has a real projective zero. Therefore we can conclude that for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  the form  $f^{(n)}$  will be strictly positive.

## 7. SYMMETRIC MEAN INEQUALITIES OF DEGREE FOUR

We now are able to characterize quartic symmetric mean inequalities that are valid of all values of  $n$ . Recall from Section 2 that  $\mathfrak{P}_4$  denotes the cone of all sequences  $\mathfrak{f} = (f^{(4)}, f^{(5)}, \dots)$  of degree 4 power means that are nonnegative for all  $n$  and  $\mathfrak{S}_4$  the cone of such sequences that can be written as sums of squares.

In the case of quartic forms the elements of  $\mathfrak{P}_4$  can be characterized by a family of univariate polynomials as Theorem 3.4 specializes to the following

**Proposition 7.1.** *Let*

$$\mathfrak{f} := \sum_{\lambda \vdash 4} c_\lambda \mathfrak{p}_\lambda$$

*be a linear combination of quartic symmetric power means. Then  $\mathfrak{f} \in \mathfrak{P}_4$  if and only if for all  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$  the bivariate form*

$$\Phi_{\mathfrak{f}}^\alpha(x, y) = \Phi_{\mathfrak{f}}(\alpha, 1-\alpha, x, y) := \sum_{\lambda \vdash 4} c_\lambda \Phi_\lambda(\alpha, 1-\alpha, x, y)$$

*is nonnegative.*

Now we turn to the characterization of the elements on the boundary of  $\mathfrak{P}_4$ .

**Lemma 7.2.** *Let  $0 \neq \mathfrak{f} \in \mathfrak{P}_4$ . Then  $\mathfrak{f}$  is on the boundary  $\partial \mathfrak{P}_4$  if and only if there exists  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  such that the bivariate form  $\Phi_{\mathfrak{f}}^\alpha(x, y)$  has a double real root.*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathfrak{f} \in \partial \mathfrak{P}_4$ . Suppose that for all  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  the bivariate form  $\Phi_{\mathfrak{f}}^\alpha$  has no double real roots. From Proposition 7.1 we know that  $\Phi_{\mathfrak{f}}^\alpha$  is a nonnegative form for all  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$  and thus  $\Phi_{\mathfrak{f}}^\alpha$  is strictly positive for all  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ . Thus that for a sufficiently small perturbation  $\tilde{\mathfrak{f}}$  of the coefficients  $c_\lambda$  of  $\mathfrak{f}$  form  $\Phi_{\tilde{\mathfrak{f}}}^\alpha$  will remain positive for all  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ . Now we deal with the cases  $\alpha = 0, 1$ .

We observe that for all  $\mathfrak{g} \in \mathfrak{M}_4$  we have

$$\Phi_{\mathfrak{g}}^0(x, y) = \Phi_{\mathfrak{g}}^{1/2}(y, y) = \Phi_{\mathfrak{g}}^{1/2}(1, 1)y^4 \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi_{\mathfrak{g}}^1(x, y) = \Phi_{\mathfrak{g}}^{1/2}(1, 1)x^4.$$

By the above we must have  $\Phi_{\mathfrak{g}}^{1/2}(1, 1) > 0$  and the same will be true for a sufficiently small perturbation  $\tilde{\mathfrak{f}}$  of  $\mathfrak{f}$ . But then it follows by Proposition 7.1 that a neighborhood of  $\mathfrak{f}$  is in  $\mathfrak{P}_4$ , which contradicts the assumption that  $\mathfrak{f} \in \partial \mathfrak{P}_4$ . Therefore there exists  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  such that  $\Phi_{\mathfrak{f}}^\alpha(x, y)$  has a double real root.

Now suppose  $\mathfrak{f} \in \mathfrak{P}_4$  and  $\Phi_{\mathfrak{f}}^{\alpha}(x, y)$  has a double real root for some  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ . Let  $\mathfrak{f}_{\epsilon} = f - \epsilon \mathfrak{p}_{22}$ . It follows that for all  $\epsilon > 0$  we have  $\mathfrak{f}_{\epsilon} \notin \mathfrak{P}_4$ , since  $\Phi_{\mathfrak{f}_{\epsilon}}^{\alpha}$  is strictly negative at the double zero of  $\Phi_{\mathfrak{f}}^{\alpha}$ . Thus  $\mathfrak{f}$  is on the boundary of  $\mathfrak{P}_4$ . □

In order to algebraically characterize the elements on the boundary recall that the discriminant of a bivariate form is a homogeneous polynomial in the coefficients, which vanishes exactly on the set of forms with multiple projective roots. However, note that  $\text{disc}(f) = 0$  alone does not guarantee that  $f$  has a double real root, since the double root may be complex.

**Theorem 7.3.** *A symmetric inequality of degree 4 holds if and only if it can be written as a sum of squares for all  $n$ , i.e., we have*

$$\mathfrak{S}_4 = \mathfrak{P}_4.$$

*Proof.* Since  $\mathfrak{S}_4 \subset \mathfrak{P}_4$  and both sets are closed convex cones, it suffices to show that every  $\mathfrak{f}$  on the boundary of  $\mathfrak{S}_4$  also lies in the boundary of  $\mathfrak{P}_4$ .

It follows from Theorem 6.8 that a sequence  $\mathfrak{f} := (f^{(4)}, f^{(5)}, \dots)$  that can lay on the boundary of  $\mathfrak{S}_4$  but not on the boundary of  $\mathfrak{P}_4$  is either of the form

$$\mathfrak{f} = a^2 \mathfrak{p}_4 + 2ab \mathfrak{p}_{31} + (c^2 - a^2) \mathfrak{p}_{22} + (2cd + b^2 - 2ab) \mathfrak{p}_{211} + (d^2 - b^2) \mathfrak{p}_{1111},$$

such that the coefficients  $a, b, c, d$  meet the conditions in (6.4) or of the form

$$\mathfrak{f} = a^2 \mathfrak{p}_{(1^4)} + b_{11} (\mathfrak{p}_{(2,1^2)} - \mathfrak{p}_{(1^4)}) + 2b_{12} (\mathfrak{p}_{(3,1)} - \mathfrak{p}_{(2,1^2)}) + b_{22} (\mathfrak{p}_{(4)} - \mathfrak{p}_{(2^2)}),$$

with coefficients meeting the conditions in (6.5). Thus in order to conclude the Theorem we show that every  $\mathfrak{f} \in \mathfrak{M}_4$  of the above form is on the boundary of  $\mathfrak{P}_4$ .

We begin with the first case and aim to verify that for any such  $\mathfrak{f}$  there exists an  $\alpha$  with  $0 < \alpha < 1$  such that the discriminant  $\delta_{\mathfrak{f}}$  of  $\Phi_{\mathfrak{f}}^{\alpha}(x, y)$  vanishes at  $\alpha$ , and the corresponding double root of  $\Phi_{\mathfrak{f}}^{\alpha}(x, y)$  is real. Using the formulae for discriminants of bivariate forms we calculate that  $\delta_{\mathfrak{f}}(\alpha)$  factors as

$$\delta_{\mathfrak{f}}(\alpha) = 16(\alpha - 1)^3 (c + d)^2 \alpha^3 Q_1(\alpha) Q_2(\alpha)^2,$$

where

$$Q_1 := \Gamma_1 \alpha^2 - \Gamma_1 \alpha - 16a^2(c + d)^2,$$

with

$$\Gamma_1 = (4cd - 8ad + 4a^2 + 4ab + b^2 - 8ca + 4c^2) (4cd + 8ad + 4a^2 + 4ab + b^2 + 8ca + 4c^2).$$

and

$$Q_2 := \Gamma_2 \alpha^2 - \Gamma_2 \alpha + a^2(c + d),$$

with  $\Gamma_2 = 4a^2d - b^2c - 4abc$ . We turn to a detailed examination of the factors and start with the following **Claim:** Under the preconditions on  $a, b, c, d$  the polynomial  $Q_1$  has no root for  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  and  $Q_2$  always has a root for  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ .

To prove the first part of the claim just observe that we have

$$Q_1(\alpha) = Q_1(1 - \alpha)$$

and

$$Q_1(0) = Q_1(1) = -16a^2(c + d)^2 < 0.$$

Further we have

$$Q_1\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) = -\frac{1}{4} (4a^2 + 4ab + 4cd + 4c^2 + b^2)^2 < 0.$$

Which clearly implies  $Q_1(\alpha) < 0$  for all  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ .

To see the second part of the claim we observe that

$$Q_2(0) = Q_2(1) = a^2(c + d) > 0,$$

under the conditions on  $c, d$ . On the other hand we have

$$Q_2\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) = \frac{1}{4}c(2a+b)^2 < 0$$

since  $c$  is supposed to be negative. This clearly implies that  $Q_2(\alpha)$  has two real roots  $\alpha_{1/2}, 1 - \alpha_{1/2} \in (0, 1)$ . Therefore the polynomial  $\Phi_{\mathfrak{f}}(\alpha_{1/2}, 1 - \alpha_{1/2}, x, 1)$  has a double root.

However, it remains to verify that this double root is indeed real. In order to establish this we examine the situation of possible roots of  $Q_2$  more carefully: Denote by  $\nabla(Q_2)$  the gradient of  $Q_2$  with respect to  $(a, b, c, d, \alpha)$ . Since  $Q_2$  is a square, we have that for any tuple that satisfies  $Q_2(a, b, c, d, \alpha) = 0$  we have  $\nabla(Q_2)(a, b, c, d, \alpha) = 0$ . Setting

$$g_1 := a^2d + a^2c + 4\alpha^2a^2d - 4a^2\alpha d - 4ab\alpha^2c + 4ab\alpha c - \alpha^2b^2c + b^2\alpha c,$$

we can write

$$\nabla(Q_2) := 2g_1 \cdot \begin{pmatrix} 2ad + 2ac + 8\alpha^2ad - 8a\alpha d - 4b\alpha^2c + 4b\alpha c \\ -4a\alpha^2c + 4a\alpha c - 2b\alpha^2c + 2b\alpha c \\ a^2 - 4ab\alpha^2 + 4ab\alpha - \alpha^2b^2 + b^2\alpha \\ a^2 + 4\alpha^2a^2 - 4a^2\alpha \\ a^2\alpha d - 4a^2d - 8ab\alpha c + 4abc - 2b^2\alpha c + b^2c \end{pmatrix}.$$

Thus it follows that any tuple  $(a, b, c, d, \alpha)$  which is compatible with the conditions in (6.4) and for which  $\nabla(Q_2)(a, b, c, d, \alpha) = 0$  holds will thus either satisfy  $g_1(a, b, c, d, \alpha) = 0$  or will have  $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$  and  $a = -\frac{1}{2}$ .

In the case where  $g_1(a, b, c, d, \alpha) = 0$  it follows that  $d = -\frac{c(a^2 - 4ab\alpha^2 + 4ab\alpha - \alpha^2b^2 + b^2\alpha)}{a^2(2\alpha - 1)^2}$ . This yields that  $\Phi_{\mathfrak{f}}(\alpha^*, 1 - \alpha^*, x, 1)$  contains the factor  $(ax + a + b\alpha x - b\alpha + b)^2$ . Thus under this condition  $\Phi_{\mathfrak{f}}(\alpha^*, 1 - \alpha^*, x, 1)$  has real double root at

$$x = -\frac{a + b - b\alpha}{a + b\alpha}.$$

In the second case we first observe that under the condition  $a = -\frac{1}{2}$  and  $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$  the polynomial  $Q_2$  specializes to  $1/4c(-1 + b)^2$ . Thus the discriminant is zero if and only if  $b = 1$ . Therefore we get under these conditions

$$\Phi_{\mathfrak{f}}\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, x, 1\right) = \frac{1}{16} (d + 2dx + 2c + 2cx^2 + dx^2)^2$$

and we can establish that  $x_{1/2} := \pm \frac{-d + 2\sqrt{-c(c-d)}}{2c+d}$  are the two double roots in this case. As under the conditions posed on  $c, d$  by Theorem 6.8 we have that  $-c(c-d) \geq 0$  these roots will also be real. Therefore we have shown that in all cases the roots are indeed real.

To conclude we also investigate the remaining case. Here we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{\mathfrak{f}}^{\alpha}(x, y) &= (a^2 - b_{11})\Phi_{(14)}(\alpha, 1 - \alpha, x, y) + (b_{11} - 2b_{12})\Phi_{(212)}(\alpha, 1 - \alpha, x, y) + 2b_{12}\Phi_{(31)}(\alpha, 1 - \alpha, x, y) \\ &\quad - b_{22}\Phi_{(22)}(\alpha, 1 - \alpha, x, y) + b_{22}\Phi_{(4)}(\alpha, 1 - \alpha, x, y). \end{aligned}$$

One verifies that for  $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$  the resulting univariate polynomial has a double root at  $(x, y) = (1, -1)$ . Since this shows that in all possible cases we have  $\mathfrak{f} \in \partial\mathfrak{S}_4 \Rightarrow \mathfrak{f} \in \partial\mathfrak{P}_4$  we can conclude that  $\mathfrak{S}_4 = \mathfrak{P}_4$ . □

**7.1. Open questions.** Besides Conjecture 1 we feel that there is another important question left open in our work. Corollary 6.2 gave a description of the asymptotic symmetric sums of squares cone in terms of the squares involved. Note that not all semi-invariant polynomials were used. It is natural to investigate the situation also in arbitrary degree:

**Question 1.** *Let  $\mathfrak{f} \in \mathfrak{S}_{2d}$ . What semi-invariant polynomials are necessary for a description of  $\mathfrak{f}$  as a sum of squares?*

The general setup of our work focused on the case of a fixed degree. Examples like the difference of the geometric and the arithmetic mean show however, that it would be very interesting to also understand the situation where the degree is not fixed.

**Question 2.** What can be said about the quantitative relationship between the cones  $\Sigma_{n,2d}^S$  and  $\mathcal{P}_{n,2d}^S$  in asymptotic regimes other than fixed degree  $2d$ ?

## 8. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The research was initiated during the IPAM program on Modern Trends in Optimization and its Application and the authors would like to thank the Institute for Pure and Applied Mathematics for the hospitality during the program and the organizers of the program for the invitation to participate in the program. We thank the anonymous referee for helpful comments that greatly improved this paper and Roland Hildebrand for bringing the article by Terpstra to our attention.

## REFERENCES

- [1] F. Bergeron. Algebraic combinatorics and coinvariant spaces. *CMS Treatises in Mathematics.*, 2009.
- [2] G. Blekherman. There are Significantly More Nonnegative Polynomials than Sums of Squares. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, 153, 2006.
- [3] G. Blekherman. Nonnegative Polynomials and Sums of Squares to appear in *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, *arXiv:1010.3465*.
- [4] G. Blekherman, P.A. Parrilo, R.R. Thomas, *Semidefinite Optimization and Convex Algebraic Geometry*, MOS-SIAM Series on Optimization, Vol. 13, SIAM and the Mathematical Optimization Society, Philadelphia, 2013
- [5] D. A. Beck, J. B. Remmel and T. Whitehead. The Combinatorics of Transition Matrices between the Bases of the Symmetric Functions and the  $B_n$  Analogues *Disc. Math.* 153: 3-27, 1996.
- [6] C. Chevalley. Invariants of Finite Groups Generated by Reflections *Am. J. Math.* 77(4 ): 778–782, 1955.
- [7] M. D. Choi, T. Y. Lam. Extremal positive semidefinite forms. *Math. Ann.* 231:1–18, 1978 .
- [8] M. D. Choi, T. Y. Lam, B. Reznick. Even symmetric sextics. *Math. Z.*, 195:559–580, 1987.
- [9] A. Cuttler, C. Greene, M. Skandera. Inequalities for symmetric means *Eur. J. Comb.*, 32:745-761, 2011
- [10] K. Gatermann, P. Parrilo. Symmetry groups, semidefinite programs, and sums of squares. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 192:95-128, 2004.
- [11] W. R. Harris. Real even symmetric ternary forms. *J. Algebra*, 222:204–245, 1999.
- [12] A. Hurwitz. Ueber den Vergleich des arithmetischen und des geometrischen Mittels. *J. reine und angew. Math.* 108:266-268, 1891
- [13] G. James, A. Kerber. *The Representation Theory of the Symmetric Group*. Addison-Wesley, Reading (MA), 1981.
- [14] I.G. Macdonald. *Symmetric Functions and Hall Polynomials*. Oxford Mathematical Monographs. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979.
- [15] V. Powers and T. Wörmann. An algorithm for sums of squares of real polynomials. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 127: 99–104, 1998.
- [16] M. Ramana, A.J. Goldman. Some geometric results in semidefinite programming. *J. Global Optim.* 7: 33-50, 1997.
- [17] C. Riener, T. Theobald, L. Jansson-Andrén, J. B. Lasserre. Exploiting Symmetries in SDP-relaxations for polynomial optimization, *Math. of OR* 38 (1):122–141, 2013.
- [18] C. Riener. On the degree and half degree principle for symmetric polynomials. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 216:850–856, 2012.
- [19] B. Reznick. Some concrete aspects of Hilbert’s 17th problem in Real Algebraic Geometry and Ordered Structures, (C. N. Delzell, J.J. Madden eds.) *Cont. Math.*, **253** (2000), 251-272
- [20] B. Sagan. *The Symmetric Group*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 203, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2001.
- [21] R.P. Stanley. Invariants of finite groups and their application to combinatorics *Bull. AMS* 1:475–511, 1979.
- [22] R. Steinberg. Differential equations invariant under finite reflection groups *Trans. Am. Math. Soc.* 112:392–400, 1964.
- [23] J.-P. Serre. *Linear Representations of Finite Groups*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 42, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2001.
- [24] W. Specht. Zur Darstellungstheorie der symmetrischen Gruppe. *Math. Z.* 42:774–779, 1937.
- [25] F.J. Terpstra. Darstellung biquadratischer Formen als Summen von Quadraten mit Anwendung auf die Variationsrechnung. *Math. Anal.* 116: 66–180, 1939.
- [26] V. Timofte. On the positivity of symmetric polynomial functions. Part I: General results. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 284:174–190, 2003.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, GEORGIA TECH, 686 CHERRY STREET, ATLANTA, GA 30332

AALTO SCIENCE INSTITUTE, AALTO UNIVERSITY, PO BOX 11000, FI-00076 AALTO, FINLAND